



Mr. *WHISTON*'s
R E P L Y

To the Right Honourable the
Earl of NOTTINGHAM.





Mr. *WHISTON*'s
L E T T E R

To the Right Honourable the
Earl of *Nottingham*,

CONCERNING

The *Eternity* of the *Son of God*,
and of the *Holy Spirit*.

The FOURTH EDITION, Improved.

To which is Prefix'd,
A Large PREFACE, upon occasion of the
Lord NOTTINGHAM'S *Answer* to that Letter.

And whereto are Added,
Athanasian Confessions, that the *Antenice* Writers were
against the *Athanasian*, and for the *Eusebian* Doctrine.

Est Deus Pater omnium Institutor, & Creator ; solus Originem
nesciens, invisibilis, immensus, immortalis, æternus, unus
Deus : cujus neque magnitudini, neque majestati, neque
virtuti, quicquam, non dixerim præferri, sed nec compa-
rari potest. Ex quo, quando ipse voluit, Sermo Filius natus
est. — Accepit Paracletus a Christo quæ nunciet : Major
ergo jam Paracleto Christus est ; quoniam nec Paracletus à
Christo acciperet, nisi minor Christo esset. *Novatian. de*
Trin. §. 31. 24.

L O N D O N,

Printed for J. SENEX, at the *Globe* in *Salisbury-Court*, *Fleet-*
street ; and W. TAYLOR, at the *Ship* in *Pater-noster-Row*.
M.DCC.XXI.

MR. W. H. STONE
L. E. T. R.



To the Right Hon. the

Earl of Nottingham

concerning

The Ministry of the Lord God
and of the Holy Spirit

The Bishop of Exeter

Trinity Hall

A letter from the Earl of Nottingham
to the Bishop of Exeter

And the Bishop of Exeter

Ministry of the Lord God
and of the Holy Spirit

The Bishop of Exeter
Trinity Hall
Exeter

The Bishop of Exeter
Trinity Hall
Exeter

The Bishop of Exeter
Trinity Hall
Exeter

The Bishop of Exeter
Trinity Hall
Exeter

The Bishop of Exeter
Trinity Hall
Exeter

The Bishop of Exeter
Trinity Hall
Exeter



P

M



thip
with
per
and
Pri
kno
thip
ing
my
mu
hav
upo
and
pin
hav
Pri
suc



PREFACE.

MY LORD,

SINCE Your Lordship has at last been pleased, when I least expected it, to do me the *Favour* and *Honour*, for so I justly esteem it, of sending me a printed *Answer* to that printed *Letter* which I took the boldness to address and send to Your Lordship near two Years ago; and since you have prevailed with yourself to treat me, generally speaking, in my personal Capacity, after a rather more Humane, Kind, and Christian Manner, than I perceive your Religious Principles will well allow: I cannot but gratefully acknowledge myself very much obliged to Your Lordship; especially, since you have been so far from rejecting, with Disdain, even in Your Lordship's high Station, my plain manner of Application, as many Persons much under Your Lordship's Quality would probably have done, that you have been pleased to take thereupon a great deal of true pains, in order to your own and my Satisfaction. 'Tis, however, my great Unhappiness, as well as Your Lordship's, *That* your Enquiries have been chiefly confin'd to about a third part of the Primitive Testimonies alledg'd in my Letter; or of such only, whose Originals Your Lordship's Study

B

afforded:

afforded : *That* your Enquiries and Explications are all along upon the foot of such *modern* Notions and Inferences, as seem to me of small weight in this Controversy : and *That* Your Lordship intirely omits and forgets the *principal Scope and Design* of that Letter. As to the *first* of which, Your Lordship's Chaplain, Mr. *Seaton*, and, I suppose, yourself, has a great while well known how near the rest of those Primitive Original Authors you wanted were to Your Lordship's Seat at *Burley*, and how readily you might have commanded the Use of any of them : which Circumstance make this *partial* hearing of the Witnesses, in so very important a Cause, the more surprizing and unaccountable. As to the *second* thing, the modern *Athanasian Inferences and Deductions*, which Your Lordship's Answer is every where so full of ; Your Lordship might easily see by my Letter, and the very nature of the Enquiry itself, which was confin'd to the Ages before *Athanasius*, that I could not but esteem them *Petitio Principii*, a direct *Begging of the Question* ; and that they could not be of any considerable weight with me. Indeed, while I was, according to my Education, an *Athanasian*, and took the usual Methods of modern Parties ; I mean, while I chiefly read such late Books as Bishop *Pearson* on the Creed ; and consulted such late Commentators as Dr. *Hammond*, Bishop *Patrick*, or Bishop *Kidder*, &c. who, how great and good Men soever they were, never did, never durst thoroughly examine such a *certain*, such a *settled*, such a *fundamental* Doctrine, as that of the *Athanasian Trinity* was then esteem'd to be : this kind of Reasoning would have been tolerable good Evidence with me. Nor do I believe that a Sermon, which I once preached for a Relation in *London*, on a *Christmas-Day*, and partly in Vindication of the common Explications of the Trinity and Incarnation, went upon any better Arguments than what appear in Your Lordship's Answer. But when afterward, tho' not without some superstitious Fear and Dread upon me, I prevail'd upon myself to search to the bottom of this Matter, and, without the least regard to any thing that had pass'd in or since the Days of *Athanasius*, to enquire uprightly and thoroughly, by a careful Perusal of Originals, what were the real *Doctrines*, and what was the genuine *Worship* of the Christian Church, in and immediately after the



the Apostolick Age itself ; I was soon, I was fully satisfied, that what I had so long believed, even as in some sort *fundamental*, was unsupported by, and generally contrary to, the plain natural Sense of a vast number of *Texts* of Holy Scripture ; to the clear *Testimonies* of the Old *Catechetical Instruction*, and of all the numerous ancient *Creeds*, both which were chiefly intended to teach all Christians these very *Doctrines* of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* ; to all the antient *Precepts* and *Examples* of *Religious Worship*, and all the genuine original *Forms* of *Christian Doxology* ; to much the greatest part of the *antient Testimonies* in the Catholic Christian Writers of three Centuries and an half ; nay, to the very *Doctrines*, and *Decrees*, and *Confessions* of Faith of the Body of the Catholic Church, not only at the Great Council of *Antioch* in the third, but at the like Great Councils of *Nice*, *Tyre*, *Constantinople*, *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Sardica*, and *Ariminum* themselves, in the very fourth Century. I mean this, in case all the antient Records hereto belonging be understood according to the Language and Notions of those early Ages, wherein the Authors themselves lived, and not as the *Athanasians* have since been obliged to explain them. And how unwilling soever such great Admirers of our own or any other modern Church, as Your Lordship may be to suppose this to be the real Case ; yet if you look abroad among those truly learned Persons, who have formerly examined these Originals, without being engag'd to support the common Doctrine from them, you will soon find that I am very far from being singular in this Assertion. Nay, the Paper hereto annex'd will demonstrate to Your Lordship, that few of the truly learned and impartial *Athanasians* themselves, from the very Days of their Founder, till our late Writers of Controversy, Bishop Bull, Dr. Grabe, and Dr. Waterland, have denied the Truth of this Fact ; that the *Ante-Nicene Fathers* were generally against the *Athanasian*, and for the *Eusebian Doctrines*. Nor, I do assure Your Lordship, is there any truth in what you have been told, that Dr. Clarke ' rejects the Testimony of the Fathers,' tho' I do indeed think he lays too little weight upon them. But when Your Lordship observes, that Dr. Waterland takes for granted that he does reject them ; and gives this reason for it, ' because he knows they are against him ;'

Ansp. 136

Your Lordship should take this, not as a true Fact, but as an Instance how very little Credit is due to one Antagonist writing against another. But then, the *third* and greatest Unhappiness, both Your Lordship and I am under in this Debate, is, that we are quite at *cross Purposes* all the way. My Letter to Your Lordship was properly and truly design'd to prevent all farther Occasion for Dispute and Controversy in this and the like Matters; by proposing a fair, friendly, and unexceptionable Method of *Reference* and *Arbitration*, in order to the Discovery of the Truth. While, in return, Your Lordship has written a pretty large Book, in the modern way of *Controversy*, against me; and this, without letting me know, whether you agree to such a Method of *Reference* and *Arbitration* or not. Indeed, Your Lordship seems, by the nature of your Answer, either to misunderstand the Intention of my Letter, or to disclaim the Method therein proposed, and to resolve to go on in the usual way of Dispute and Controversy.

P. 3, 4, 5. Nay, Your Lordship, I perceive, expects a Reply from me, in the same way, contrary to the main Design of my Letter, and to my long settled Judgment and Resolution in that Matter. For as to myself, I am so far from my Lord, from being an Admirer of most of the Performances of the *Disputers of this World*, that tho', as I confess'd in my Letter, I have been sometimes prevail'd upon to write in that way myself; yet, as I there declare, has it been still with a great Aversion to such a Method. And from the easy Observation, that Truth is seldom thereby discover'd, I am convinc'd 'tis usually a wrong one. Our Passions are therein so apt to rise, our Zeal to take fire, and our Prejudices to overbear our Reason, and our Religion too; that the whole Method, as generally manag'd, seems to me a kind of *Prize-fighting*: wherein both sides having once drawn *Blood in Controversy*, do seldom regain that Temper, Honesty, Impartiality, Love of Truth, and Charity, which they both, perhaps, at first aim'd to preserve. Nor were I to judge by Your Lordship's own Performance, in your Answer to my Letter, have you been able at all yourself, to avoid the same Inconveniencies. For everybody may so readily observe there, so much more Good-nature, Kindness, and Fairness concerning my supposed Adversary, and the Notions in my Letter

ter, towards the beginning, than towards the end of your Answer; especially in the *Preface* and *Postscript*, which were last written; that they will be tempted to think that Your Lordship also grew warm in the Progress of the Dispute; and from a *friendly Debate* at the first, you suffered yourself to be betrayed into the more passionate Expression, of my *defying the Armies of the Living God*, and more passionate Methods of *burning* a disagreeable Book, instead of *examining it*; and of calling some things *Idolatry*, or *Blasphemy*, (on the Credit of certain modern Notions) which, I believe, will at last appear to be the real Doctrines, and the very Practices of Christ and his Apostles. To say nothing of those other warmer Intimations, in the same *Postscript*, of the wholesome Severity of *Imprisonment*, at least, if not of *stoning* or *burning*, instead of *convincing* the Church's Opposers. But this *Postscript*, My Lord, (which I would fain ascribe, if possible, to some other Person, for whom I have less Respect than I have for Your Lordship) is evidently of so very *hot* and *fiery* a Nature, that I fear it may endanger my own Temper, if I tarry too long within reach of it. So I leave it, and proceed. My GRAND PROPOSAL then, My Lord, that I may, if possible, be more explicit, and better understood than I was before, is this: ' That instead of
' one Good Man's worrying another in Disputes, in-
' stead of one Learned Christians murdering another in
' Controversies; all the Good Men, and all the Lear-
' ned Christians engag'd, would agree to meet toge-
' ther, in the peaceable Way of REFEREES OR ARBITRATORS,
' and would chuse all the original genuine Re-
' cords of Christianity for their UMPIRE: That they
' would first carefully examine into the genuine or
' spurious Nature of the several Books, to be made
' use of on both Sides in their future Enquiries, be-
' fore they allow'd their Testimonies for authentick:
' That, upon the Determination of such preliminary
' Examination, they would, in the like friendly man-
' ner, agree to extract out of all the genuine Records,
' the principal Passages that occur in every Author, re-
' lating to the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation,
' each side for themselves: That they would distin-
' guish every Author by himself, and set the distinct
' Collections out of such Author by themselves also;
' that

' that thereupon those Collections might be mutually
 ' exchang'd, and re-examin'd by the adverse Party :
 ' That every ambiguous Passage might be fairly de-
 ' bated, its genuine original Sense, at the Time, and in
 ' the Place, and in the Circumstances it was first writ-
 ' ten, enquir'd into ; its Parallels every where, in or
 ' near the same Time, and Place, and Circumstances,
 ' produc'd, and thereby its true Sense determin'd :
 ' That, accordingly, a fair Translation be agreed upon,
 ' on both sides. And farther, That in every confi-
 ' derable Testimony, the Context be considered, and
 ' as largely set down on each side, as the opposite side
 ' shall desire ; and that, if any great Difficulty or Dif-
 ' ference arise, as to the Readings or Translations,
 ' which these Referees cannot agree upon, the Read-
 ' ings and Versions of both Parties be fairly set down,
 ' in different Columns ; or a farther Reference be
 ' made to other the best Criticks, that are more un-
 ' concern'd : That the Sacred Christian Doctrines be
 ' entirely exhibited in the very Words of the antientest
 ' Creeds, and the Sacred Christian Worship be also
 ' fully exhibited in the very Words of the antientest
 ' Christian Prayers, Praises, and Doxologies, as they
 ' stood long before the Days of *Athanasius* : That the
 ' Philosophical Conjectures of any of the Antients be
 ' carefully distinguish'd from the Doctrines of Chri-
 ' stianity ; and that the Sources of such Conjectures be
 ' trac'd to their proper Fountains : That none, who
 ' have not diligently perus'd and considered the Wri-
 ' tings of, at least, the first three Centuries and an half
 ' beforehand themselves, be employ'd in this Work,
 ' or deem'd competent Referees therein : That no Par-
 ' ty Notes be added on either side, but only Refe-
 ' rences made to all the other Places in Antiquity,
 ' where any difficult Expressions occur, in order to their
 ' authentick Explication : And that, after all, the Re-
 ' ferees on both sides, draw up a faithful *Account* of
 ' all this, and sign it under their joint Hands, without
 ' any farther Interposition of either side ; and recom-
 ' mend the same faithful Account, and that only, to
 ' the free Perusal of every good Christian, in order
 ' to his most authentick Satisfaction.' This, My Lord,
 is that *Grand Proposal*, which I presume to address,
 in the most serious and solemn manner I am able, to
 Your

Your
 the m
 minin
 Natu
 moni
 most
 Pract
 and
 mong
 such
 nutes
 Sigh
 affor
 Prov
 secut
 who
 I see
 soev
 miti
 their
 had
 Tru
 the
 whi
 intr
 Con
 Me
 Tru
 Wo
 gai
 me
 wh
 tha
 on
 vu
 Da
 fer
 wh
 ye
 Lo
 of
 A
 ot
 it

Your Lordship, and to the whole Christian World, as the most authentick and satisfactory Method of determining these Controversies, and all others of a like Nature, which depend upon antient Facts and Testimonies ; and This is what I have all along aim'd at in most of my own Papers, and have carried as far in Practice as I have been able : I mean, among an Honest and Inquisitive Society, of all Parties and Notions among Christians, which formerly met at my House, on such an excellent Design ; and whose Orders and Minutes, (both which Your Lordship shall command a Sight of at any Time) when they are published, will afford the World no inconsiderable Specimen thereof. Provided always, My Lord, that all Thoughts of *Persecution* or *Prosecution* be laid aside, at least during the whole Progress of such an Examination. For so much I see of the Frailty of the present Age, that how much soever any of the Learned therein may *admire* the Primitive Confessors and Martyrs, very few care to *imitate* their Example, in hazarding either *Life*, or *Liberty*, I had almost said, or *Preferment* either, for the sake of Truth, and of true Christianity. This, My Lord, is the plain, honest, downright *Method of discovering Truth*, which I have so long, and so zealously endeavour'd to introduce, instead of the usual one of writing *Books of Controversy* on all Occasions : And by this, or the like Methods only, do I expect that those glorious Things, *Truth* and *true Christianity*, will one Day prevail in the World. As to myself, I have, in so many Instances, gain'd that Satisfaction in the like way of Enquiry, I mean, still by going directly to the *Originals* themselves, which I could never obtain from *Books of Controversy*, that I, of course, fall into it naturally upon all Occasions ; and have thereby learned greatly to despise that vulgar unchristian way of *angry Controversy*, and *peevish Disputation*. And, I hope, Your Lordship will not be offended with me, if, in the rest of this *Preface*, instead of writing a direct and particular *Reply* to your *Answer*, which yet it would be no very hard thing to do, I produce to Your Lordship such cogent Reasons for this better Method of Enquiry, and those chiefly drawn from this your own Answer to my Letter, as may induce Your Lordship and others to think more favourably of it, and encourage it ; and thereby, perhaps, at last occasion you that Sa-

tisfaction

tisfaction in these Points, which I can no way promise myself from the making any more compleat Reply, in the common way of Disputation. For,

I. This is the only Method, that I know of, for discovering the *whole Truth*, and the *entire Evidence* in this Matter; while, in the ordinary way, 'tis very rare, if not without Example, that any side fully represents *all* their Opponents Arguments and Testimonies without Concealment. Thus altho' I had endeavour'd pretty fully to represent both sides of the Evidence, as to the proper *Eternity* or *Coeternity* of the Son and Holy Spirit with the Father, in my Letter; yet does Your Lordship, in even a comparative long Answer, avoid the Examination of much the greatest part of my Testimonies, because Your Lordship's Study, it seems, happen'd not to furnish you immediately with the Originals. And How often, My Lord, do Writers of Controversy make long Replies to some Arguments, which they think they can tolerably well deal with; while much stronger are conceal'd, or run hastily over, because they are not so pliable? Thus even Your Lordship entirely avoids a main part of my Evidence, from the larger Epistles of *Ignatius*, and even from the *Apostolical Constitutions* themselves; without the thorough Examination of both which ancient and authentick Records, as I esteem them, it is absolutely impossible to give me Satisfaction. For since I am *fully perswaded* of the Genuineness of those *Epistles*; and, I venture to say it, am still more *certainly assur'd* of the Genuineness of those *Constitutions*: those *Eusebian Doctrines* and *Worship*, which the *Athanasian Criticks* have hitherto so greatly complain'd of, as contain'd in those Books, are to me little less than *Demonstration*, that such were the *Original Doctrines*, and such the *Original Worship* of Christians, derived to them from Christ himself, his holy Apostles, and the other Apostolical Fathers; how little soever Your Lordship has consider'd them, or how angry soever Your Lordship or any others may be, at my positive Assertions concerning them. Give me leave, My Lord, to mention here only *One Observation*, or Matter of Fact, concerning those *Constitutions*, which I have thoroughly enquir'd into, and find to be undeniably true, *viz.* That these *Constitutions* do *frequently*, and do *always* cite the Readings of the Texts of the Old Testa-

ment,

ment, according to such pure and uncorrupt Copies, as were extant in the Apostolical Age, and in the Days of *Josephus*; but since A. D. 128. or thereabouts, have never appeared among Christians. Which single Observation I take to be itself not only a *very probable*, but an *entirely certain* Argument, that these Books are genuine Records of that first Age, or of really *Apostolical* Antiquity and Authority. Nor will a great many stronger Objections, than those which Your Lordship or others have hitherto made against the Constitutions, which Your Lordship owns you have not yet much considered yourself; be at all a Counterpoise for this single *Demonstration*. And whoever made Your Lordship believe, that there was any other *Contrariety* in those Books to the known Gospels, than such smaller Variations or Differences between them, in their present Copies, as appear between those known Gospels themselves, even in our best Copies of them also; and which are still, in both cases, real and evident Marks of their *genuine* Nature, and *unconcerted* Composure, have greatly imposed upon you. There is no doubt but many Copies of such long-neglected Books as the *Apostolical Constitutions*, ought to be compar'd; and many new Enquiries made into Christian Antiquity by skilful Criticks, before we shall be able, every where, to settle the true Reading, or clear every remaining Difficulty, in so large and particular a Work as that is. But such Objections, and many others which lie by me, ready for future Examination, notwithstanding; I venture to affirm it again, as a thing *certain*, that *These Constitutions are really Genuine and Apostolical*. He that hath Ears to hear, let him hear.

II. This Method of Referees, is the only one that is proper for discovering whether the *Antient Monuments* we appeal to, in this Dispute, be truly *genuine*, and of sufficient *Authority*, to support our Assertions or not. For every one, that is well read in Church-History, knows what spurious Texts of Holy Scripture, and what spurious Books of Antiquity, the old Hereticks, and the *Athanasians* after them, have either entirely forged, or grossly interpolated, and put upon the World as original and uncorrupt Writings of Antiquity; and that the separating this sort of *Chaff* from the *Wheat*, has been one main Business of the Christian Criticks ever since

the Revival of Learning in *Europe*. And how many of these spurious and interpolated Writings the more ignorant Papists, and unlearned *Athanasians*, still make use of, any one that reads their Writings, or personally converses with them, cannot be unappriz'd. Nor is even Your Lordship got quite clear of such Citations Yourself, even as to several Texts of Holy Scripture in this very Answer ; as we shall see anon. Thus, How long did the *Athanasians* vouch a spurious Book, written about the *fifth* Century, and entitled, *Of the Consubstantial Trinity*, to belong to no less and no later a Person than the famous *Justin Martyr* himself, in the former part of the *second*. Which spurious Writing I have met with several times cited against me by Mr. *Mattaire*. Thus Dr. *Waterland* himself ever cites our present *Hypolytus contra Noetum* [tho' not with so grossly modern a Title as did Bishop *Bull*, *De Deo Trino & Uno*, or, *Of the Trinity in Unity*,] as in general a genuine and uncorrupt Book ; whereas 'tis at least one half of it interpolated by an *Athanasian*, since the *fifth* Century : as the Comparison of a large Passage antiently quoted out of it, both in *Greek* and *Latin*, by *Theodoret* and Pope *Gelasius*, even in the *fifth* Century does evidently demonstrate. Nay, he condescends so low, as to allege a grossly spurious Manuscript in the *Bodleian* Library, falsely ascrib'd to *Origen* ; tho', as I am inform'd, even he does it without pretending that it is genuine. Nor, as I remember, has Dr. *Mangey* been more faithful in that Matter. Your Lordship also ventures to quote *1 John* v. 7. as a genuine Text, which is now giving or given up by all the truly Learned, even by Dr. *Bentley* and Dr. *Waterland* themselves ; and concerning which the present Dispute is, whether ever any one *Greek* MS in the World, that was really written before Printing came in, had it : I mean otherwise than in the Margin, as an Interpolation. Nay, Your Lordship still cites that strange *Creed*, whereof all the truly Learned are so much ashamed, as belonging to *Athanasius* himself ; which Original thereof is now universally given up, as indefensible. Possibly Your Lordship, who are pleas'd to allege this as One of the Reasons for Your Citation of *1 John* v. 7. as genuine, that 'Tis enough for You that You find this Text in Your Bible ; [tho' that Text was still in the old *English* Bibles, only in such small different

P. 135,
136.

P. 52.

P. 136.

re
sh
dl
Ch
cal
for
tai
ed,
For
Co
per
nafi
Yo
fian
lus's
Arch
thou
know
conc
frequ
Auth
Copi
some
gave
Parts
himse
Learn
of hi
weak
conce
the
shame
much
throug
own
hereto
the W
persist
shall b
nient
those
and so
and
Verfic

rent Characters, or with such particular Marks, as shew'd it not to be in the Original, till about the middle of the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*:] because the Church of *England* in her Articles [tho' not Liturgy] calls this Creed *Athanasius's*, may think, that 'Tis enough for You, that You find it so called there; tho' it now certainly appears, and 'tis agreed upon among all the Learned, both Papists and Protestants; that there is no sort of Foundation for such an Opinion, but that it was the Composition of a spurious Author, above a Century, perhaps above four Centuries after the Death of *Athanasius*. Thus neither Bishop *Bull*, nor Dr. *Waterland*, nor Your Lordship, nor indeed any of the modern *Athanasians*, are ashamed to cite *Rufinus's* Versions of *Pamphilus's* Apology for *Origen*, and of *Origen's* own Book *Peri Archon*, for genuine Testimonies to *Origen's* Orthodoxy; though *Rufinus* himself openly confesses, and it is well known by all the Learned, that in such Passages as concerned the Doctrine of the Trinity, his Versions did frequently disagree from those Words of these original Authors which he translated, as they stood in all the Copies of his Age; (which Words he confesses to be sometimes too grossly Heretical to be set down) but gave us others in their stead: either pick'd out of other Parts of *Origen's* Works, and inserted as he pleas'd, as himself pretended; or as *Ferom* affirms, and as the Learned commonly suspect, sometimes entirely devised of his own head for that purpose. I say nothing of that weak and ridiculous Piece of the same knavish *Rufinus*, concerning the *Adulteration of the Books of Origen*, which the *Athanasians*, and Your Lordship also, are not ashamed to allege to the like purpose; even after the much more Learned and Impartial *Ferom* had himself thoroughly confuted and exposed it, even in *Rufinus's* own Age also. About which Matters, the *Confessions* hereto annex'd will, I hope, give Your Lordship and the World full Satisfaction. If the learned *Athanasians* persist to quote such Authorities as these against us, I shall begin to fear, that they will also think it convenient to vote for the Genuineness of many other of those spurious Writings, which they have so honestly and so unanimously discarded in the two last Centuries; and that, by degrees, the *Athanasian Creed*, *Rufinus's* Versions of *Origen*, *Gregory of Neocæsarea's* Creed and

Miracles, with the forementioned Treatises, *De Deo Trino & Uno*, Title and all, and *De Consubstantiali Trinitate*; with the rest of the *Athanasian* Rubbish, which they seem now to be sorry they have parted with, tho' they know not how to defend, will be boldly reassum'd, and cited with an open face against their Opposers. I speak not here without real Apprehensions. For I know that the *Athanasian* Cause greatly wants those Assistants; that it finds itself sinking apace for want of them; and that there are some Persons in the World, and they not of the grossest Characters neither, that will think it better to connive at, if not to countenance some such *pious Frauds* again, than to have the Nakedness of the modern Churches too evidently appear in such important Matters. — *Principiis Obsta*, is certainly, My Lord, a very fit Caution in these cases. But this by the By. Thus also, to conclude this Particular, the *Athanasians*, and Your Lordship among them, do with the utmost assurance most frequently cite *Tertullian*, for the Catholick Tradition concerning the grand Article of the *Consubstantiality*, even in those his Writings, wherein he is known to have followed the *Montanists* false Prophecies; and wherein he openly confesses that he did so; nay, wherein he openly professes and pleads, that this very *Doctrine*, (or rather *Philosophical Notion*) of the *Consubstantiality*, was directly a Branch of the *Montanist Enthusiasm*; and indeed never once pretends to any higher Original for it. And this the *Athanasians* do without all *Shame* or *Reflexion*. I have some time since, My Lord, so fully detected this *egregious Fallacy*, in a particular Pamphlet of my own upon that Head, that I venture to send it to Your Lordship together with this; and to beg your careful Perusal of it, before you any more quote *Tertullian*, the *Montanist*, for an Evidence, that the *Consubstantiality* is a Doctrine deriv'd down from Christ and his Apostles. And I fully expect, that none of the truly Learned *Athanasians* will quote him for that purpose hereafter, till those Facts, those evident and notorious Facts, advanc'd in that Pamphlet, can be disprov'd by them. This last Instance is not indeed of the Citation of a *spurious Author*, as are the foregoing; but it contains so unfair and pernicious a Practice, and one so near of kin to the other, that I chuse to take this opportunity to introduce it.

True Origin of the
Sabellian
and *Athanasian*
Doctrines

it, and to give Your Lordship, and the World again, due Caution about it. But the Examples of such gross Deceits and Impositions in the Writers of Controversy are innumerable; which Deceits and Impositions would be generally avoided, by that *Reference* here proposed: Otherwise, when our quarrellsome Disputants will cease to be themselves cheated, or will no longer cheat the World this way, no body can determine.

III. This Method will prevent those frequent Complaints of *false Translations* of antient Passages on both Sides, which now make so great a Noise, and take up so much room in our Books of Controversy. Nor would this Your Lordship's Answer, I dare say, be taken so much Notice of by my Adversaries, as it now is, were it not for this and another such like Handle which you catch at, relating to some of my *Translations*, and *Citations* of the antient Testimonies. And I am far from denying, that Your Lordship, in three or four Places, have turned the *Greek Expressions* more nicely than I had done before; for which I return Your Lordship Thanks: And according to which nicer rendring, the Passages now stand in this corrected Edition. Tho' I dare appeal to every candid Reader, whether those Testimonies be not almost as pregnant to my purpose in *this*, as they were in the *former Translation*. But then, My Lord, I must be allow'd here to give the like Examples on Your own part; and to complain, in my Turn, against several of Your Lordship's Translations; which seem to me, indeed, such, as none but an *Athanasian* would have made. However, before I mention any of those mistaken Translations themselves, I shall observe one thing, by way of Preliminary, *viz.* That where, in my Translation of a very remarkable Letter, Place of Antiquity, I mean of the Words of *Trypho* to p. 13. *Justin Martyr*, concerning the God of *Israel's* having made *Christ*, I had before neglected the proper Force of the *Greek Expression* (though not *for*, but *against* my own Opinion) Your Lordship does not at all except against, or correct that my inaccurate Version, which, yet in Equity, was as proper to have been done as any of the rest. The Place, I mean, is that where *Trypho* directly assures *Justin*, that tho' that Divinity of *Christ* should prove true, which *Justin* had been before so largely proving to him, yet it still followed, that the God,

God of *Israel* did, καὶ αὐτὸν τῶτον ποιῆν, *make*, not *him* only, as I before rendered it, without its due Emphasis, but *even this Person himself*; did *make* this very Person, whom he here supposes to be Lord, and Christ, and God; as *Justin* had asserted concerning him. And yet this Expression, My Lord, how heretical or blasphemous soever it be esteemed in the latter Ages, *Justin Martyr*, no way blames, as either false or rash in his Adversary. And now, My Lord, having noted this *Mistranslation* of my own, which Your Lordship did not think fit to correct, I proceed to those *Mistranslations* of Your Lordship's, which seem to me to stand in as great need of Correction, as any of those of mine which Your Lordship has corrected. In the first place, therefore, I complain of Your Lordship's Exception against my true Translation of an Expression of *Origen*, and of Your Lordship's mistaken Translation of it. I render

P. 46, 47. γενῆς Θεός, *the made God*, when spoken by *Origen* of the Son. This, you say, is done *very perversely and falsely*, and, in opposition to this *very perverse and false* Version of it, you render it, *The Begotten God*. This is a strange thing indeed! that a declar'd *Athanasian* should complain of the most literal rendring of γενῆς in the World; even in a Case where, if Your Lordship's Management were pursued, it would utterly subvert the very Foundation of the *Athanasian Scheme*: For the supposed mighty Difference there is between ποιῶν and γεννᾶν, between γενῆς and γεννῆς, i. e. between *making* and *begetting*, between *Creation* and *Generation*; between *made*, or *created*, and *begotten*, in these Cases, how small soever in itself, is one of the grand Foundations of the *Athanasian Hypothesis*; in which *Eternal Generation* is fundamental Doctrine, and *Eternal Creation* a most absurd Heresy or Blasphemy. So that how Your Lordship ventures to confound these Words, in your Version, in opposition to me, who, with all the Learned, at least all the learned *Athanasians*, render γενῆς, *made*, I can give no account; especially while you had yourself, in the very foregoing Page, when it better served your Purpose, expressly rendered ἀγενῆς, in the very same Author, *Unmade*, or *Uncreated*; and had you not so rendered it, the Passage you was quoting on your Side, would, even in your own Opinion, have been impious and heretical. Though, indeed, I must assure Your Lordship, that I

See the
Benedictine
Edition
of *Athanasius*,
Vol. I. p.
206, 207.

do no
Your
either
one Pl
herenc
and L
of all
Expre
pose f
is, as
ship's,
where
αὐτὸν,
ginal
Your
any M
apply
as oth
does y
the M
old V
it sec
than
that o
ἐποίνο
gin of
rende
marg
truly
Lord
certa
Christ
Twela
to be
Christ
woul
word
this A
Here
ward
Phila
'tis
from
Loro

do not at all believe, that *Origen* ever affirmed, as Your Lordship cites him, that our Saviour was ἀγέννητος, either *Unbegotten*, or *Unmade*; as the Word stands in one Place of his present Copies. Both the entire Coherence of that very Place; *Origen's* known Doctrine and Language elsewhere; as well as the absolute Silence of all his antient *Athanasian* Vindicators as to any such Expression or Doctrine of his, utterly forbids us to suppose such a thing of him. But this by the By. There is, as I conceive, another Misttranslation of Your Lordship's, relating to this matter; I mean of *Heb. iii. 2. P. 96. 100.* where you turn the Greek Words, πιστὸν ὅντα τὸ ποίησαντι αὐτόν, *Faithful to him that appointed him*; when the Original runs literally, *Faithful to him that made him*. And Your Lordship says, you would not have believ'd from any Man, but myself, that I should so translate and apply it. Our common *Englist* Version indeed, as well as other *Athanasian* Versions also, render the Text as does your Lordship; but then our Version confesses in the Margin, that in the Greek it is *made* him; and the old Vulgate, or Italick, directly and literally renders it *fecit, made him*. Nor does there seem to be more than one truly parallel Place in the whole Bible, and that omitted by Your Lordship also, where that Word ἐποίησεν can be fairly interpreted *appointed*, as the Margin of our Bibles quotes it, *1 Sam. xii. 6.* and where we render it *advanced*: But even there we find, in the marginal Note, the literal rendring also *made*; I say, truly parallel Place, for I cannot allow that any of Your Lordship's Examples here alledged are so: It being certainly one thing to *make* a Person a Ruler; to *make* *P. 97, 98.* *Christians, Kings and Priests unto God*; to *make* or *ordain Twelve to be with Christ*; and *to be sent forth to preach*; to be *made an High Priest*; and quite another, to *make Christ* absolutely, without any such Addition at all. Nor would any Interpreter, I suppose, have render'd the words otherwise than I do, were it not that they take this Author's Doctrine, in that its obvious Version to be Heretical; as was directly and commonly done towards the end of the fourth Century, in the Days of *Philastrius*, as I formerly noted in my Letter. Though *P. 31.* 'tis not indeed improbable, that many might incline, from the Coherence, to paraphrase the Text, as Your Lordship, and the *Athanasians* translate it. Good, My Lord,

Lord, let our *Translations* of the very Words of the Bible, wherever it can well be so, be literal, whatever our *Paraphrases* or *Expositions* may be; and consider a little, whether, if the Author to the *Hebrews* had been used to think it *Blasphemy* and *damnable Heresy*, as do the *Athanasians*, to say, that God *made Christ*, in the only obvious, if not the only possible Sense of that word in the *Greek Language*, he would not have chosen another word to express God's *appointing* him to the Office of an High Priest. And why, as to the only two directly parallel Expressions, in or near the Apostolical Age, concerning Christ, that God did, *ποίησεν αὐτόν*, *make him*: I mean that in *Trypho*, lately mentioned, and this in the Author to the *Hebrews*; You still allow, that in the *One* it truly signifies, that Christ was a *Being made by God*; while, it seems, it is *Heresy* and *Blasphemy* to think so of the *Other*. I farther complain, my Lord, that Dr. *Hammond* mistranslates, and Your Lordship paraphrases, as if you had mistranslated a famous, but obscure, Passage in *Athenagoras*; where he speaks of the natural Unity and Dependance there is between the Father and the Son; and, in the third Rank, even the Holy Spirit also, which no Christians properly deny; as if he had directly called the Holy Spirit *God*, and had directly affirmed, that the *Three Persons were One God*, which two Doctrines the *Athanasians* usually find in that Passage: Yet does *Athenagoras* directly avoid both those Expressions and Assertions, even in this Context; which yet, of almost all others in Christian Antiquity, did the best admit of, or require, such Expressions and Assertions; and thereby lets us plainly know, that those Expressions and Assertions were not consistent with the Christian Language and Notions in his Days. But the modern *Athanasians*, and among them Your Lordship, have been so long us'd to call the Holy Spirit directly *God*, and this even in your solemn Worship itself, and to affirm, as a Fundamental of Christianity, that the *Three Persons are One God*; that you readily supply what the antient Catholick Christians never did, never durst say upon such Occasions. Nor is the Term *God*, I think, directly used by any Catholick Christian, concerning the Holy Ghost, in about three Centuries and a half. Nor was it ever, that I know of, used by any sober Author, Heathen, Jew, or Catholick

Ham. in
1 John
v. 7.
P. 146.

Cath
Perso
for C
whic
I beg
casion
Mist
πεδ
τη βα
all A
pressi
whic
rathe
to fo
from
that
Wor
Auth
self,
Wh
look
long
unc
ther
Cre
and
εξ α
πεδ
Eter
You
tern
Lon
con
it;
to n
nec
in t
aga
Ans
stra
in
shor
all
Lo

Catholick Christian for a complex Notion, or for *Three Persons in one Substance*; nor indeed for any other than for *One single Person*, till the very Days of *Athanasius*: which eminent, which important, which notorious Facts, I beg Your Lordship will carefully remark upon this Occasion. I complain, in the next Place, of Your Lordship's Mistranslation of *Eusebius's* Words, *Ἐξ αἰῶν* & *μᾶλλον δὲ* P. 61. *πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων ἐκ τῆς τῆ πατρὸς ἀνεκφράστου καὶ ἀπεριανοήτου βουλῆς καὶ δυνάμεως ὑπαρχόντων. From Eternity, and before all Ages, being substantiated of, or according to the inexpressible and inconceivable Counsel and Power of the Father; which is literally no more than this, before the Age, or rather before all the Ages, &c.* And Your Lordship seems to forget the Occasion of this Language, which is taken from the Epistle to the *Hebrews* itself; which affirms, *Heb. i. 2.* that those *Ages* were created or *made*, together with the *World*, by the Son of God: *By whom also*, says that Author, *he made*, *τὰς αἰῶνας*, *the Ages*; not the *World* itself, as we paraphrase it, instead of translating it. Whence, as we shall observe hereafter, the Antients still looked on the Words *Time*, and *the Ages* thereto belonging, not as any way fit to denote the absolute and uncreated *Eternity* of, or *Co-eternity* with God the Father; but as belonging to the *World* itself, with the *Creatures* contain'd therein, at or after their Creation, and not otherwise. And if Your Lordship translates, *Ἐξ αἰῶνος*, from *Eternity*, the following Words, *μᾶλλον δὲ πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων*, must be translated, *or rather before all Eternities*: The Absurdity of which Expression, upon Your Lordship's Notion of an absolute Scholastick Eternity, still referred to by the Antients, forced Your Lordship into this Mistranslation. But whether *βουλῇ*, concerning the Origin of the Son, be *Will*, as I render it; or *Counsel*, as Your Lordship, 'tis much the same to me: there being room neither for *Will* nor *Counsel* in necessary Emanations; such as the *Athanasians* dream of in this Case: And indeed dream of, not only without, but against every single Expression both in Scripture and Antiquity hereto relating. And till they give up this strange, and antiently unheard of Pretence of *Necessity*, in the Derivation of the Son from the Father, they should never once mention Primitive Antiquity at all under this Article. I likewise complain of Your Lordship's Translation of *ὑπόστασις*, *Heb. i. 3.* by *Sub-*
D *sistence*,

- P. 89. *sistence, or Person, in the nice Athanasian Sense of that Word: Whereas the Learned well know, and have frequently observed it, that this Word appears never to have been used in that Sense till the Days of Athanasius; nay, that it was not then generally appropriated to that Sense without great Controversy and Disturbance;*
- Ep. 57, 58. *of which, two of Jerom's remarkable Epistles to Pope Damasus make particular mention. Your Lordship is so much used to, so well versed in the modern Language about the Trinity, that you readily imagine the Author to the Hebrews to have been so too: while there is no Pretence for the modern Signification of the Word ὑπόστασις, in about three hundred Years after the Days of that Author. I complain also, My Lord, about that*
- P. 130. &c. *famous Text in St. Paul, Rom. ix. 5. not that your own, and our Bibles rendering of, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τὰς αἰῶνας. Ἀμήν. Who is over all, God blessed for ever; Amen; may not be a just Translation; but that You affirm, that my other rendering, The God over all, or, who is over all, be blessed for ever; Amen: is not also a just Translation; I mean on the account of the natural Ambiguity there is in the Original: where, without the Discovery of the genuine puncta ion, which the oldest Manuscripts do not give us, ὁ ὢν may either connect this Sentence to the foregoing, and then the usual rendering is right; or it may begin a Sentence, and then my rendering is right. And though the Athanasians may not care to hear of such Examples, as have ὁ ὢν in the beginning of Sentences, yet are there not a few of them even in the New Testament itself. Your Lordship may please to consult them at your leisure, as they here follow; Mat. xii. 30. Mark xiii. 16. John iii. 31. viii. 47. xviii. 37. Rom. xiii. 1. 1 Thess. v. 8. and see how many more Examples you can find of the other Connection; which I here set down also, so far as my Observation has discovered them there: John i. 18, iii. 13. vi. 46. xii. 17. 2 Cor. xi. 31. Col. iv. 11. I also greatly complain, My Lord, that you, with our common Version, render those eminent Words of St. Paul, Phil. ii. 6. Οὐχ ἄρπαγμαὺν ἢ ἡπάλο τὸ εἶναι ἰσὰ Θεῷ. thought it not Robbery to be equal with God; contrary to all the parallel Examples of the like Phrase among the Greeks; contrary to all its Renderings and Explications in the earliest Antiquity; and contrary to the plain and obvious Reasoning*
- P. 90, 128, 129.

Reasoning of St. Paul in that whole Coherence. Nor do I believe that Dr. Waterland's weak and wavering Vindication of the common Version of this Text, in his Sermon at St. Paul's, has, or ever will, satisfy any one considering Person, that this is the true rendering of it. And certainly a Text which, in the Original and Context, most naturally signifies, that Christ *did not take upon him, or did not lay claim to be equal, or even like to God*, is very awkwardly alledg'd for an *express Proof*, as Your Lordship does, that he *did claim an Equality with God*. But above all, My Lord, I complain of Your Lordship's Version and Paraphrase of Origen's famous Passage concerning the *creating, or making*, of the Holy Spirit by the Son; as if because *μᾶλλον* is the comparative Degree, he might only mean, that the Spirit was *more honourable than all things made by the Father, by Christ*, without being himself *one of them*: Whereas the whole Context that follows, which I for brevity omitted in my Letter; tho' I had elsewhere set it down more largely, as I have now done in this Edition here also; as well as what went before in my Citation, is direct and plain; and all Antiquity allows it for Origen's Doctrine, that the Holy Spirit received his very *Existence*, as well as his *Perfections*, from the Father, as the Original; and by the Son, as the Instrument; and that he was the *most Honourable* of all those Beings that thus received their Existence and Perfections by the Mediation of the Son; or of *all those things that were made by the Son*, in the Text he was expounding. This Version and Paraphrase of Your Lordship's is so very contrary to the plain and confessed Sense of the Place, and so little to your own Satisfaction, as appears by those doubtful Words that immediately follow in your Answer, that I cannot but wonder at it. I appeal to your own cool Thoughts, whether this be not more like a *wilful Imposition* on your Readers, than any or all my mistaken Versions put together. Yet because Your Lordship, in the whole Tenour of your Answer, seems to me sincere, I will not suspect any want of Integrity even in this Case; but rather impute it to the unhappy Nature of Disputation and Controversy, which frequently betrays Persons, otherwise very honest, into such unjustifiable Dealing, as in other Circumstances they would themselves greatly abhor. And thus Your

Lordship may at length perceive, that these Complaints of *false Translations* will not be all of one side; but that the *Athanasians*, and among them Your Lordship, while a Writer of Controversy, will have, at least, an equal Share: and that by Consequence nothing can prevent these Complaints, or the Occasions of them, but such a mutual *Reference* as I am now recommending

- IV. This Method will prevent another common Occasion of Complaint on both sides, *viz.* That the Quotations are not *large enough*, or that some Clauses, either before or after what is set down, are *artfully omitted*. This is one of the greatest Faults Your Lordship finds with my Letter, and that very often also. Thus you say
- P. 28. of one of my Quotations out of *Eusebius*, that I omit somewhat before it, because it did not suit with my Doctrine: That I left out an *And*, that my Reader might think that God the Word was begotten by a Communication from the Father of some created Substance. You afterward
- P. 29. ask me, *Why did you stop so unfairly, by drawing a Line, and omitting some Words that followed?* And again, *Why did you omit what immediately preceded your Quotations?* Again, *Now this, &c. is the most extraordinary and unfair that ever I met with.* Again, *Why did not you proceed?* And you say that the Author I had there cited, *Tertullian* by Name, did immediately add to the Word *Created*, the Word *Begotten*: Nay, that *Tertullian* thereupon said, *Exinde tum Parem sibi faciens, de quo procedendo Filius factus est*: Hence making him Equal to himself, by proceeding from whom, he is made the Son. A strange Inference this last, My Lord! that the Generation or Creation of any Being by God himself, should make that created or begotten Being equal to his Creator or Father! Nor will the Context at all bear such an Inference. A late judicious Author has spoiled all this, by observing, very justly, that when Bishop *Bull*, or others, cite this Place as a Proof of the real *Parity* or *Equality* of the Son to the Father, they only build upon a puerile misspelling of the Copies, *Parem* for *Patrem*, *Equal* for *Father*, as the Coherence here, and other Passages elsewhere, evidently shew. But this by the way. Farther; I quoted this Passage from *Origen*, *They are illuminated by that Wisdom, which is the Efflux or Splendor of the eternal Light*; and this merely to shew, that he called the Son not the Coeternal *Efflux*
- Modest
Plea, p
306.
- See my
Letter
under
Tertullian.
- or
some

or *Splendor of the Eternal Light*, as the *Athanasians* would
 love to speak; but joined the *Epithet Eternal* to the Father
 only, without any farther Concern with the Coherence.
 Now, says Your Lordship here, *They! who? I guess you* P. 43.
were ashamed to tell me; and so you proceed to wonder at
 me, and expose me, without any Occasion in the
 World. Afterwards Your Lordship complains, that *Ip.* 59.
leave out a great deal of a Passage of Eusebius; as if I
were conscious that he had not said enough for my purpose,
and that what I cite, I cite by Piece-meals: And then, says P. 60.
 Your Lordship, *follows a Passage which you have omitted*
in this Place, because, in your own Judgment, it does not
consist with the Doctrine which you would have Eusebius to
assert. In the two next Pages also you set down two
 more Passages that I had omitted. Again, you com-
 plain, that *I stop with a Stroke, according to my Custom,* P. 81.
because the next words are an Answer to the Question, and
would have shewn that my Quotation was not to my pur-
pose. Is not here, My Lord, a sufficient number of
 Complaints? And those sometimes greatly aggravated
 against me? Yet, upon a Review, I do not find that I
 was once to blame, on account of any of these Omis-
 sions. I was selecting Passages that belonged to one
 distinct Doctrine, that of the real *Co-eternity*, without
 directly meddling either with the *Divinity* in general,
 or *Consubstantiality*, or *Coequality*; and I think it appears,
 by all Your Lordship's Instances, that I had omitted no
 one thing in the Places cited that properly concerned
 that Doctrine. Now because Your Lordship, as well
 as Bishop Bull, and others, always find yourselves great-
 ly press'd with the Plainness and Number of the antient
 Texts and Testimonies upon this single Head; which
 you can no way pretend to balance by those opposite to
 them: you then are forc'd to take shelter in some
 other Expressions of the same Writers, that seem to you
 to favour the *Divinity* in general, or the *Coequality*, or
 the *Consubstantiality*; and from thence, by a novel way
 of Deduction, collect that Doctrine of the proper *Co-*
eternity. While yet 'tis notorious, that the principal, and
 almost only antient Writer, who is express for a sort of
Consubstantiality, and somewhat like *Equality*, I mean
Tertullian, when a *Montanist*, is also as express against
 the proper *Coeternity*; he directly affirming, with a
 somewhat more than *Arian* Boldness, that there was
 even

Letter,
p. 15.

even a Time when God was not a Father, and had not a Son; and as for the Divinity in general, the Learned cannot but know, that both the *Apostolical Constitutions*, and the larger *Epistles* of *Ignatius*, which the *Athanasians* so greatly complain of, as favouring the *Arians*, do oftner call our Saviour God, than do the known Books of the New Testament themselves. So that, under this Head, I have great reason to complain of Your Lordship's Treatment of me, and to insist, that I be not blamed, for the Necessity Your Lordship was under, of enlarging many Quotations, in order either to divert the Reader from the natural Importance of the Passages produced by me; or, if possible, to fish out somewhat in the Context, that by the modern way of *inferring at a Distance*, and *drawing remote Consequences*, might make a Shew of contradicting me; and this because you greatly wanted *direct Testimonies* yourself for the *Coeternity*. That there is but One strictly *Eternal Being*, or *Person*, the *Father*; and that when it pleased him, and not otherwise, the Son was created, or begotten, in order to his ministring to him in the Creation of all subordinate Beings, even of the Holy Spirit himself, is evidently the Doctrine of Christian Antiquity, even of the Catholick Church, at and after the Council of Nice itself; as I have, I think, fully proved in my *Vindication of the Council of Nice from the Athanasian Heresy*; and in my *Collection of antient Monuments* thereto annex'd; which I take the boldness to present also to Your Lordship, together with these Papers. And I venture to say, that if once the early Studies of Christian Divines were chiefly confin'd to the Sacred Scriptures, and to the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, as they ever ought to be, such Notions, and such Inferences, as the *Athanasians* now frequently use, and depend on, would gradually wear out of the Church; and the Learned would at last wonder, that Doctrines so strange, and so little supported by Sacred or Original Authority, as many of theirs are, should ever have been entertained among Christian People. Which is the Case with many of the most Learned at present, with respect to both the Popish and Calvinist Tenets: whilst yet both these have formerly been thought by many, not only really true, but fully supported by Sacred and Ecclesiastical Antiquity also. And certainly, My Lord, the only Remedy

for

for
and I
after
by fa
to Yo
and r
a shre
own
minat
V.
INCON
Writi
both
any fa
of th
I kno
some
stake
ship co
the D
shew
cordin
Conse
to be
You
or em
Trini
other
Integr
best A
could
Blessi
ago, r
New
Christ
ing th
nation
had f
there,
Thucia
severa
of Ori
found
ther P

for all such Complaints of Omissions, Prévarications, and Impositions, and for the Occasions of them hereafter, must be that impartial Method of Examination by fair *Referees*, which I am now so earnestly proposing to Your Lordship's Consideration and Encouragement: and the Refusal of which Proposal by any side, will be a shrewd sign that their Cause will not, even in their own Judgment, bear such a degree of Impartial Examination.

V. The same Method would prevent another great inconvenience, frequently incident to Controversial Writings; and that is, the *Mistakes* in the Writers on both sides, of one another's *Meanings*: Nor need I go any farther than Your Lordship's Answer, for Examples of this kind. I believe Your Lordship will allow, that I know my own Meaning best; and that I can, with some Assurance, inform Your Lordship when You mistake it. And here, in the first Instance, Your Lordship concludes, that I have a *Scheme* of my own, about Pref. p. 3. the Doctrine of the *Trinity*; and that I am obliged to 4. shew that this *Scheme* is *Rational*, as well as *True*. Ac- P. 159. cordingly Your Lordship sometimes presses me with Consequences from the *Arian Scheme*, which You take to be mine. Now I must assure Your Lordship, that You greatly mistake me. I never did, never durst make or embrace any particular *Scheme* or *Hypothesis* of the Trinity or Incarnation, whether of my own, or any other Man's Contrivance whatsoever. But, with all the Integrity and Impartiality I was master of; with the best Assistance and Help of my learned Friends that I could procure, and with hearty Prayers for the Divine Blessing and Direction; I went, about thirteen Years ago, to make a through Search into the Books of the *New Testament*, and all the other *Original Records of Christianity*, till after the Council of Nice itself, concerning these important Doctrines of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*. And when, upon the Result of that Search, I had found the several Branches of those Doctrines there, as I might find any other Facts in *Herodotus* or *Thucydides*, I observed, on the Comparison, that those several Articles of the Original Doctrine and Instances of Original Worship and Doxology, which I had thus found by the antienter Books themselves, did of all other Parties that I had ever heard of, most nearly, if not per-

perfectly agree with the Doctrine, Worship, and Doxologies of those called *Eusebians* in the former Part of the Fourth Century ; *i. e.* with the greatest and best Part of the Christian Church, especially in the East, till near the middle of the Fourth Century itself : and that those *Eusebians* did also agree with me, and with the antient Catholicks, in rejecting all human Additions, and novel Terms of Art therein, whether on the *Arian* or *Athanasian* side ; and so preserved the Christian Worship in its antient Purity, without any Alteration as to the old Objects, or Manner of Adoration and Doxology : which Alterations the *Athanasians* were then zealously introducing into the Church. I also found by the History of that Fourth Century, that the unjustifiable Rashness and Folly of *Arius*, and his peculiar Followers, about their Philosophical Opinions on one Side, (which yet agree much better to our modern exacter Notions, than do the *Athanasian*) did, in less than a Century, by a sad, but very natural ἀμείλεια τῆ ἀνθροπίνης, and the Conspiration of many unlucky Circumstances, gradually betray the greatest Part of the Church into the contrary more dangerous and unwarrantable Extreme of the *Montanist* or *Athanasian Heresy*. These were the Facts, My Lord, that I discovered to be true in Christian Antiquity. And I have been so far from advancing any New, or Peculiar, or indeed any Human Scheme or Hypothesis whatsoever, that I gathered every Article of the antient Christian Doctrine, in those Points, distinctly from the Fountains themselves ; and thence, and indeed thence only, set them down in my *Fourth Volume of Primitive Christianity Revived*. And altho' it be indeed to me a great Pleasure, which Pleasure the *Athanasians* cannot pretend to on their Side, to perceive, upon Recollection, that those antient Christian Doctrines are intelligible and rational, as well as that they are fully attested to by Christian Antiquity ; yet was it the Original Evidence, Sacred and Primitive, that was the proper Foundation of my Faith and Practice, and not a Fondness for any plausible or agreeable Scheme whatsoever. Accordingly, I have the great Satisfaction to see, that no small part of those honest, impartial, and learned Persons, who have since given themselves leave fully to examine these Points, in the same way, have been forced to declare for the same Doctrines, Worship, and Doxologies

logies themselves ; even sometimes against their own former violent Prejudices to the contrary. So that, My Lord, I look upon myself here obliged to no more than one thing only ; and that is, to justify the *Truth of that Fact* I have asserted, and which I certainly know to be true : viz. That it is plain from very great superior Evidence, in three Centuries and somewhat above half, that such were the Primitive *Doctrines*, such the *Worship*, and such the *Doxologies* of those early Ages of the Gospel, as I have set them down in that fourth Volume, and no other. And, with Your Lordship's leave, I say farther, that if the Learned and Pious Dr. *Knight*, or any other *Athanasian*, thinks he can discover the *Trinity in Unity*, even all over the Books of the Old Testament, I am unconcern'd ; since I find, that neither Christ himself, nor his Apostles, nor their Followers, ever discover'd such Notions there. If Dr. *South* or Dr. *Sherlock*, Dr. *Bennet* or Dr. *Waterland*, *Arius* or *Socinus*, &c. either make *New and Heretical Schemes* of their own ; (for I use the Words *New and Heretical* as perfectly synonymous in this Case) or take up any other *Old Heretical Scheme*, as did *Athanasius* ; if they adorn and recommend, improve and vindicate them never so much, as He did ; I also am unconcerned : For while the *Original Records* of Christianity are extant, they will demonstrate, that what I have given an Account of, and that only, is the *Christian Scheme* ; and by degrees the truly Learned, as they dare, and as they think proper, will discover and confess it. And if once Dr. *Waterland*, Dr. *Knight*, and the other really learned *Athanasians*, will freely and publicly own this true State of the Case ; viz. ' That the *Original Doctrines*, and *Worship* and *Doxologies* of the Gospel, as understood and practised by the Apostles, the Apostolical Fathers, and the main Body of the Catholick Church, till the Days of *Athanasius*, if we be judg'd by the *Primitive Records themselves*, without the Reasonings of the *Moderns*, were the same with those I have given an Account of from their Writings, in my fourth Volume, as they ought in Justice to do ; I shall give them leave to frame and embrace what other more agreeable Schemes or Hypotheses soever they please, without any Disturbance from me ; or without my concerning my self with their Notions or Writings thereto

E

belonging :

belonging: Unless, perhaps, in the way of Diversion
 and Amusement; as I may sometimes peruse the novel
 Schemes of Government, or Religion, which the *Col-
 lins's*, the *Tolands*, the *Tindals*, the Authors of the *Inde-
 pendent Whig*, and the like weak and wild Writers of our
 Age, amuse us with upon all Occasions. I am still of
 the very same Opinion I was, when many Years ago I
 told one, that is now a Prelate of our Church, when he
 refer'd me to a Pamphlet of his, containing a sort of
New Scheme of the Doctrine of the Trinity, that ' I
 ' begged his Pardon, for I had not read it. That had
 ' I desired to have known *His Scheme*, I would certain-
 ' ly have read *His Pamphlet*; but being alone desirous
 ' of knowing the *Christian Scheme*, or what was the
 ' Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, I only searched
 ' into those *Original Records of Christianity* which con-
 ' tain'd it.' In which way of proceeding I was immedi-
 ately commended by a very great and good Man, then
 in Company with us, afterward a Prelate of our Church
 also, but now with God, as having taken the *right*
 Method of Enquiry and Determination. If indeed,
 My Lord, there were room for Mistake as to this
 Matter of Fact, it would be kind in any of the
 Learned to endeavour to set me right. But while I
 still find that the Fact is certainly true; so certainly,
 that the most Learned have, till lately, generally ac-
 knowledg'd it to be so; as the *Confessions* of even the
Athanasians themselves hereto annex'd, will evident-
 ly demonstrate; I am no way to be influenc'd from
 any other Authorities or Reasonings whatsoever: I mean
 on the Supposition of the *Truth* and *Perfection* of the
 Christian Revelation only. But to leave this Digres-
 sion, and to proceed upon the *Mistakes* of one ano-
 ther, which arise among Writers of Controversy. Your
 Lordship, by taking me for a proper *Arian*, goes far-
 ther; and puts this Question, *With what Face can Arians*
ask the Favour of an Indulgence or Toleration from any,
who have ever read the History of their Barbarities? Now
 my Reply is here very plain; that if the proper *Arians*,
 or some that sprang from them, did ever use any such
Barbarities, which I do not deny; the *Athanasians* have
 been sufficiently even with them, by an almost uninterr-
 rupted Course of 1300 Years *Persecution*. But what is
 that to the *Eusebians*? who all along condemned both
 the *Arians* and *Athanasians*; and who never, that I
 know

know of, "did *persecute* any one Person properly for their religious Notions. *Eusebius* himself of *Nicomedia*, from whom the *Eusebians* then took their Denomination, and *Theognis* of *Nice*, were banished with *Arius*; and that, as they say themselves, not for supporting his rash Notions, and novel Language, but for not subscribing to his Condemnation; because they were persuaded he was not guilty of the things he was charg'd with. And 'tis well known, that the most Learned *Eusebius* of *Cæsarea*, was himself obliged to sign rather more, at that Council, than he was well satisfied with; or else all his Learning had hardly sav'd him from the same Punishment. Which *Banishments* at the Council of *Nice*, I take to be the *first* grand Instance of *Persecution* among Christians, that Church-History affords us. But the later Ages have been commonly so ignorant, and so wicked, that they have first affixed false and odious Names to honest and learned Men, that differ from them; and then exposed them to *Reproach* and *Banishment*, and, it may be, to *Fire* and *Faggot*, for knowing things better than the rest of their Neighbours. Your Lordship also takes it for granted, that I set up *Natural Religion*, as a *New*, but *very improper and inadequate Rule*, by which we are to determine this Controversy. How far I am from setting up such a *Rule*, and what *Rule* I really go by, in judging of Matters of this Nature; Your Lordship has understood, by what I have just now said: so I need say little more upon this Head. If the Christian Religion were not both *rational*, and *well attested to*, I could not believe it. But in Matters of Faith, where we have consistent and intelligible Notions deliver'd; (which yet I greatly question whether the *Athanasians* have;) I profess myself obliged to submit to the Clearness of the Revelation, and to the Original Texts of Scripture, and Testimonies of Antiquity; tho' otherwise I could not myself have been able to discover such things by Natural Reason. Had I made my own Conjecture, what sort of a *Messias* God Almighty would have been pleas'd to send to Mankind, for their Salvation, I, and I suppose all other Men besides me, should, with the Old *Ebionites*, and Later *Socinians*, have readily suppos'd, that such a Saviour would have been no more than a *Great Prophet*, or a *Meer Man*. But since I am fully satisfied, that such a

Antient
Monu-
ments, p.
231, 232.

Ibid p.
91—95.

P. 7.

P. 1.

Notion of our Blessed Saviour is entirely inconsistent with the Christian Revelation, I never once set up my own imperfect Guesses against the Doctrine of that Saviour himself, and of his Holy Apostles. So that Your Lordship utterly *mistakes* me in this Particular also. Another gross *Mistake* Your Lordship and others run too hastily into; *viz.* That we, who cannot go into the *Athanasian* Scheme, do really *Reject the Divinity of Christ*; and, in the common *Athanasian* Language, imitated, tho' in an oblique Manner, by Your Lordship, *Deny the Lord that bought us*. Those that know not much of the antient Records of our Religion, but chiefly read modern Controversies and Commentators, are somewhat more excusable, if they join in such a rash and popular *Odium*; while they may innocently *suppose*, that there is some real Foundation for such an Imputation. But for the truly Learned in Antiquity, such as Dr. *Waterland*, I wonder their Consciences do not fly in their Faces, and tell them *they are inexcusable*. It being very obvious every where in the truly Primitive Writers, that the *Divinity of Christ* was then understood, of his being the Word of God, before the World began; by whom, as by his Instrument or Deputy, the Supreme God at first made, afterward governed, and will at last judge the World; and in proper Opposition to the *Ebionites*, who said he was a *Meer Man*: But without the least Acknowledgment of that absolute *Coeternity* and *Coequality* with the Father, which the ignorant *Athanasians* have since affixed to their Notion of that *Divinity*.

P. 77—82. Your Lordship also, in great Measure, *mistakes* me, where I quote three or four Texts out of the *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiasticus*, for the *Creation of Wisdom*; in order to prove that the antient Christian Doctrine was this, that the Word of God, our Blessed Lord, even in his highest Capacity, was truly *created* by the Father. The Strength of my Argument here lay in the known universal Application of that famous Text in *Prov. viii. 22.* *The Lord Created me, the Beginning of his Ways, for his Works*; to which the other in *Ecclesiasticus* are Allusions; by the antient Christians (excepting only *Irenaeus*, who applies it to the Spirit) from the very Days of the Apostles themselves, to the very Days of *Athanasius* himself; to this *Creation of Christ*, by God the Father, before the World began. And indeed, the last mention'd

tion'd Author, *Athanasius*, is himself every where so gravell'd with this Text, and yet so unable either to Orat. deny the then universally allow'd Interpretation, or to contr. A- answer the Argument drawn from thence against him rian. pas- by the *Arians*, that it would pierce the very Soul of a sim. true *Athanasian*, to see how he sweats and toils, and is ever in an Agony to find a good Answer to it; but all to no purpose: *Heret lateri lethalis arundo*. What he, at last, says, that it belongs to the *Incarnation*, is so gross, that none of his wiser Followers dare own it. Nor do I find any greater Occasion for that open *Forgery* I have fully convicted him of, in interpolating the Anathemas *Antient* of the Council of Nice, and inserting the spurious word *Monum. P.* created, among those condemned at that time, than the *196—203* grand Distress he was in from this Text. And those that observe the Reasonings of this *Athanasius*, will easily see in what stead some real Clauses in that Council, and particularly this spurious Clause against the Creation of our Saviour, stood him, in his Contests with the *Arians*. There is also so much more stress laid every where, by this *Athanasius*, upon the Votes of his three hundred and eighteen Fathers, at the Council of Nice, even in opposition to the Great Council of *Antioch*, in the third Century; and after other and greater Synods had annulled what they had done about these very Points in the fourth; than upon all the many Texts, and few other Testimonies alledg'd by him: that any one may find where he took his Strength to lie; and that he would very willingly have exchanged almost all his other Scripture Evidence, for the Dismissal of this single Text in the *Proverbs*; how inconsiderable soever Your Lordship, and other *Athanasians*, think it at this Day. And, indeed, the more Your Lordship, or the other *Athanasians*, can make it probable, that this Text did not originally belong to this matter, or was not truly translated by the LXXII. the stronger is the Argument from all Antiquities Choice of it, notwithstanding, to express thereby their own Christian Doctrine, that the Son of God was created by the Father. And, by the way, I will here presume to say, that had *Athanasius* been one tenth part so well versed in the ancient Christian Authors, as the Great *Eusebius*, one of his principal Adversaries; and known how frequently they said that Christ, in his highest nature, was a created Being; he would

would hardly have taken that fatal Step, which has bewildred him and his Followers ever since: I mean would hardly have confessed, that if God *created* Christ, or if Christ were a *created Being*, he must not have been *coeternal* with his Father, who *created* him. For since they have been forced to venture upon another Absurdity, which is just the same with this before us; and have boldly asserted the possibility of a *Son's* being *coeternal* with his *Father*; or that *eternal Generation* is neither inconceivable nor incredible: Why should they scruple to say, that a *created Being* may also be *coeternal* with its *Creator*? or that *Creation, ab aeterno*, is not more inconceivable, nor incredible, than *Generation, ab aeterno*? And I make bold to add this, that till the *Athanasians* change their Reasonings on this Head, the numerous and plain Texts and Testimonies I have produced, in my Letter to Your Lordship, from the Bible, and all Christian Antiquity, That our Saviour was certainly *created* by the Father, when carefully considered, will be so many Millstones about their Necks; and will, at length, help to sink them, and their Cause for ever. Nor do I quite despair of seeing such shrewd and cunning *Athanasians*, as Dr. *Waterland*, driven to this last Evasion; and of hearing them broach this other grand *Athanasian Mystery*, how despis'd and absurd an one soever; that any *Creature* whatsoever may be, strictly speaking, in point of Duration, *coeternal* with its *Creator*. But this is a Digression. Your Lordship also greatly *mistakes* me, when you suppose that I deny the *Trinity*, or the Christian Doctrines contained even in the Form of Baptism, concerning *the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit*; as if I did not own, that, *Let Us make Man in our Image*; *Jehovah rained Brimstone and Fire from Jehovah out of Heaven*; with many other Texts of the Old Testament, according to the antient Interpretation of the Christian Church, might justly be apply'd to the *Father* and the *Son*. What I deny, is, that these three Persons are, in the *Deity*, as Your Lordship speaks, or are the *One Eternal God*. Accordingly, upon this *Mistake*, Your Lordship proceeds to prove, by direct Texts, what is not deny'd; while what is deny'd, for want of direct Texts, is attempted to be proved by remote and modern Deductions only. Such are the *Mistakes*, My Lord, of one another's meaning, that Controversial Writings are

P. 12, 13,
107, &c.

P. 6.

liable

liable to ; and so next to impossible is it, very often, for Disputants clearly to understand each other's true meaning ; without which yet the Debates must come to little or nothing ; unless that Method of friendly discoursing such Matters together, in the fair way of *Referees*, be taken ; which I am now so zealously persuading Your Lordship to encourage.

VI. The Method I propose, would prevent that scandalous *Misinterpretation* of Scripture, which our modern Writers of Controversy have so frequently and grossly been guilty of. I take it for granted, My Lord, that the Texts of Scripture had originally, each of them, one certain Meaning ; corresponding to the obvious Sense of the Words themselves, at that Time, in that Place, and in those particular Circumstances whereto they properly belong'd : and that, by consequence, when any other Persons do put such a Construction upon them, as was not their *true meaning at first* ; if it be done wilfully, 'tis a *profane*, or *knavish* ; if ignorantly, 'tis, however, a *vain and groundless Imposition* upon us. I take it therefore for granted, that we can no other way come at the genuine Importance of the Texts of Scripture, but by using ourselves frequently to read those original Books themselves, and those nearest to them, both in Time and Place ; by considering their true Scope and Occasion, with the Opinions and Controversies of that Age and Country, when and where they were written, without any regard to the modern Designs or Interests of those Parties that have since arisen in the World, and made use of them for their several Purposes : Which original Occasions and Circumstances would alone be of weight among such impartial *Referees*, as I am now recommending. But what work all the modern Sects make with these antient Sacred Books ; what strange Interpretations they put upon their Expressions, in order to hale them over to their several sides, is most notorious, and often plainly intolerable. The Authors of the Bible are, by turns, *Arians*, *Athanasians*, *Papists*, *Protestants*, *Lutherans*, *Calvinists*, *Churchmen*, *Dissenters*, *Baptists*, *Quakers*, and *Socinians* ; and all this because it has been greatly the *Interest* of every one of these Parties, to make themselves, and others, believe that they were so. Whereas those Divine and Primitive Writers were, generally, dead a long while before either these

Arians,

Arians, or Athanasians; these Papists, or Protestants; these Lutherans, or Calvinists; these Churchmen, or Dissenters; these Baptists, Quakers, or Socinians, were arisen in the World: and, by consequence, had no particular relation to them, or their peculiar Doctrines or Factions in any of their Writings. Nor did the very Learned Dr. Mill ever speak a greater Truth, than when, at the end of his excellent Prolegomena to his Greek Testament, he said, ' That he was deceiv'd, if in the Apostolical ' Epistles, especially those of St. Paul; (and the Reason is much the same in the rest of the Books of the New Testament;) the true and genuine Sense of the ' Apostles might not be better understood, from the parallel Places of Scripture, such as he had collected ' for that Use; and from the Observations and Expositions of the Antients; who (as he emphatically and ' justly observes) vastly differ'd from the prejudicate Notions of later Expositors and Divines; than from the ' most ample and compleat Commentaries of the Learned of this and the last Age.' Nor do I believe that any truly learned Person, well versed in Antiquity, can doubt of the Truth of this Observation. Now if this be so, what a Case are the Generality of the modern Disputants, especially the Athanasian Disputants, and among them Your Lordship, in, as to your Expositions of Scripture? While, before the Rise of Montanus, there

Orig. of is scarcely one eminent Text, on which this Controversy the Sabel. is supposed mainly to depend, expounded by any Catholic and Athanasian Christian, at all in the Sense of the Athanasians; nas. Doct. And, even after that time, not one expounded properly p. 81, &c. and fully so, till the very days of Athanasius himself.

Thus, although in the Age when the Writers of the New Testament lived, and before Constantine, the word God is known to have been most frequently us'd, both by Jews and Gentiles, not only for the Supreme Eternal God himself, but for a great number of created and inferior Gods also: And although we have a full Account, that it was only then apply'd to the Son, or Word of God, in an inferior Sense, by a learned Jew,

Append. contemporary with the Apostles, I mean Philo: Yet to Com- are we now insulted by the present Athanasians, if we ment on will not acknowledge that the name God, given some the Ep. of few times in the New Testament to our Blessed Saviour, St. John, though without any Mark of its being then us'd for the Art. xiii.

Supreme God, but the direct contrary, certainly implies, that he is the *One Almighty and Eternal God* himself; nay, the *very same God*, with his own *Almighty and Eternal Father*. Thus also, although Dr. Clarke has demonstrated, that the same Term *God* did, however, in the days of Christ and his Apostles, and indeed ever before, and a good while after that time also, signify, both among *Jews* and *Gentiles*, *one only Person*; and was never then once used, by any sober Person, for a *Complex of Persons*, as in the *Trinitarian Hypothesis*: yet will they now force such a novel, strange, and absurd Interpretation upon it, that the same word *God* shall be taken to denote *three distinct Persons in one Substance*, without any Pretence from contemporary Antiquity for such an Interpretation: So that they are forced to reject that Sense of the word in the Writings of the Apostles, which is strongly attested to in the days of the Apostles; and to embrace that Sense, which has not one single Example to support it, in all those early Ages whatsoever. Thus also the *Athanasians* lay usually great weight upon such Texts as these: *God was manifested in the Flesh*; *The Church of God, which he has purchased with his own Blood*; *This is the True God and Eternal Life*; *He is God over all, blessed for ever*; *Thou hast not lyed unto Men, but unto God: I will not give my Glory to another*, &c. Nor is there any reason to doubt, but the Primitive Writers, had they had all the same Texts in their Bibles, and believed the same Doctrines that the *Athanasians* do, would have been frequently tempted to expound them, and the rest of that sort, after the same manner the *Athanasians* do. Here therefore we ask them, to shew us the *Athanasian Expositions* of them, before the Days of *Athanasius*: For that they may sound pretty well that way, after Men have, from their Childhood, been brought up in such Expositions, there is no question. 'Tis notorious, that the Papists, by long Custom, commonly think that our Saviour's words, at the Celebration of his first Supper, *This is my Body*; and *This is my Blood*, clearly prove *Transubstantiation*; that our Saviour's words of his Church, that *the Gates of Hell should not prevail against it*, import, that the Church of Rome cannot fall into great Errors: that *Feed my Sheep*, and *feed my Lambs*, and *I give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, &c. all spoken to St. Peter,

Scripture
Doctrine,
Part II.
Sect. 1 & 9,
&c. 33. &c
alibi passim.

Mat. xxvi.
26, 28.
—xvi. 18.
John xxi.
15, 16.
Mat. xvi.
19.

give the Bishop of Rome a Supreme Power over the Church of Christ. The *Calvinists* are also much persuaded, that their Interpretation of *Rom. ix.* concerning *St. Austin's* Scheme of *Election* and *Reprobation*, is true : and accordingly where the words *Elect* or *Reprobate* occur in the New Testament, they naturally apply them to those whom they call the *Elect* and *Reprobate* in their own Scheme. Nor is there any end of the Weakness and Folly of every Sect in such their *private Interpretations* of Scripture. But when we desire these *Papists*, *Calvinists*, or other Sects, to shew us their Expositions of such Texts, in or near the days of those Apostles, or Apostolical Men, whose Texts they are ; they then discover their Weakness, and are not able to produce them. Accordingly this is the very Case of the *Athanasians*, and it has been their very Case in and ever since the days of *Athanasius* himself ; who indeed has quoted almost as many such Texts of Scripture for his Doctrine, as any of his Followers ever since. And would not an honest common Reader of the *Athanasian* Writings, where the Authors talk so very big of *Antiquity*, nay of *all Antiquity* ; of the *Fathers*, nay of *all the Fathers*, as being of their Side ; imagine certainly, that these, and the like Texts, stood still in the antient Copies, as they do in the modern ones ; and were generally, if not universally, expounded by the Antients, as they are by the Moderns ? And if that cannot be proved, must it not cause to them a sensible Damp and Disappointment ? We therefore demand of the *Athanasian* Disputants, who so confidently allege these and the like Texts, as evident Proofs of the *supreme Divinity* of the Son and Holy Spirit ; even of their *Coeternity*, *Coequality*, and *Consubstantiality* with the Father ; what one *Christian Writer*, before the Rise of the *Montanists* ; or what one truly *Catholick Writer*, after *Montanus*, and before *Athanasius*, who did not take his Expositions from the *Montanists*, ever interpreted them at all in the *Athanasian* Sense, or drew any thing like the *Athanasian* Consequences from them ? And though we might justly suppose that, at least, the original Founders of their Sect, *Athanasius*, and *Basil*, and *Hilary*, and *Jerom*, and *Rufinus*, and *Didymus*, and *Epiphanius*, and *Nazianzen*, and *Nyssen*, &c. who lived in the fourth Century, or at the properest time in the World for knowing and quoting

ting such antient Interpretations; and who would naturally collect them, had they known them, for their own Support, against the opposite Interpretations of the *Arians*: yet when we here demand for even these second-hand References to such antient Interpretations, we are quite disappointed. All that can be said for most of these Authors, is, that they were *Pleaders*, or Writers of Controversy; not *Scholars*, or Readers of antient Authors, and so knew little more of those antient Books, or antient Expositions, than what the two grand Hereticks, *Origen* and *Eusebius*, taught them: which was certainly their Case. But what can be said for such learned Men as *Jerom*, *Epiphanius*, and *Rufinus*, is plainly this, That they could not cite, from the Antients, what they had never read in them; which I do not doubt was the true Cause of their deep Silence also about such *Athanasian* Texts or Expositions in Antiquity. To give Your Lordship a few Examples.

God was manifested in the Flesh. This Text so agreeable to the *Athanasians*, was yet so far from being taken in an *Athanasian* Sense by the Antients, that as Dr. Mill himself, with great Surprise, observes, it was not once cited by the *Athanasians* against the *Arians*, till A. D. 380. by Gregory Nyssen. Nor is it certain that it was even in Nyssen's own Book, much less that it was in St. Paul's Text it-self, as some of the most inquisitive Persons do find upon Examination. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

The Church of God, which he has purchased with his own Blood. This reading of the Text is also not found in any ancient Copy, Version, or Citation, till the Days of Marcellus and *Athanasius* themselves, and so could not be interpreted to support their Doctrines before. Acts xx. 28.

This is the True God and Eternal Life. Here the *Athanasians* think they have a strong Text for calling the Son *The True God*: Yet do they not shew us any Citation, or Interpretation, of it, in their Sense, before the Days of *Athanasius*. Nay, somewhat after his Days, his great Admirer *Epiphanius*, who was incomparably a more honest and learned *Athanasian* than he whom he admired, evidently appears to have been an entire Stranger to that Exposition: having plainly let us know, that he had never heard of any Text whatsoever, that called the Son *The True God*; though, for want of such a Text, like a thorow *Athanasian*, he pretends 1 John v. 20.

pretends to prove he *might* be so called, by *Consequences of his own making*. See *Athanasian Confessions*, under *Epiphanius*.

Rom.ix.5. *Who is over all, God blessed for ever*. This is the principal Text of all, on which the *Athanasians* depend, and it must be confessed, that if it did really call the Son, *The God over all, who is blessed for ever*, it looks more like a Support of the *Coequality* of the Son, than all the other Texts the *Athanasians* allege put together. Yet when we look into the most Primitive Antiquity, we shall soon find, that till long after the Rise of the *Montanists*, it was never, that we can find, so much as once cited in any such Sense, no not among those Texts, for the *Divinity of Christ*, which were collected together by the *Catholicks* against the *Ebionites*; of which yet, in the common Acceptation, it was the Principal. So that, I confess, it seems to me to have then been plainly understood, not of the *Son*, but of the *Father*. Dr. Mill also confesses, that excepting this Text, Christ seems never to have been elsewhere called, *The God over all*. The Apostolical Constitutions also, and *Ignatius*, in his larger Epistles, declare that Doctrine to be heretical and blasphemous: Nor does *Origen* fear, in his own *Greek Works*, whatever *Rufinus's* Version elsewhere says, absolutely to reject it. Nay, he took it for a Reproach upon the Christians to ascribe it to them. And when after the *Montanists* had apply'd this Text to the Son, the Church did, sometimes at least, allow of that Application; they still cautiously paraphras'd it to the *Eusebian* Sense, and no other; all which things I have elsewhere fully demonstrated.

Vindic.of
Doxol.

Actsv. 4. *Thou hast not Lyed unto Men, but unto God*. Your Lordship well knows how readily the *Athanasians* quote this as a clear Text for the *Divinity*, nay, the *Supreme Divinity* of the Holy Spirit; but, I believe, without one single Example of such an Interpretation, till the Days of *Athanasius*. And no wonder it is, that in a Case where even the least seeming antient Evidence for this *Divinity* of the Holy Spirit; [which Divinity neither the Council of *Nice* itself, nor any other Council in almost half a Century later, seem once to have so much as heard of; as appears by all the original Records relating to them:] where, I say, even the least seeming antient Evidence is very scarce and precious, and where
accord-

accordingly the *Athanasians* have been perpetually used to that Interpretation from their Childhood, the Vulgar readily take the Words in that Acceptation. And would not the very same Vulgar, My Lord, in case they had been taught from their Childhood, that Spirits and Angels were also *Coeternal, Consubstantial, and Coequal* with God, have, in like manner, thought, that when it was argued on St. Paul's behalf, that *If a Spirit or an Angel had spoken to him*, they must not oppose him, lest they should thereby *fight against God*, that therefore those *Spirits or Angels* are there called *God* also? The Reasoning is much the same in the one Case as in the other; and indeed in neither Case of any real Force at all.

Act. xxiii.
9.

Another Text, which the *Athanasians*, and among them Your Lordship, lay a mighty stress upon, to prove that the Father and Son are *One in Substance*, is

P. 8.

that in *Isaiab*, *I will not give my Glory to another*. Now,

If. xlii. 8.

Did ever any Writer before *Athanasius* draw such a Consequence from this Text? No certainly. Does not the

See xlviii.

II.

Coherence before plainly shew, that God meant to give his Glory to *no other than to the Messias*; to whom he had been promising great things in the foregoing Verses? And Do not the following words, *Neither my Praise to Graven Images*, sufficiently describe those others that God would not give his Glory to, without any strange Hypothesis about the *Consubstantiality*? Nay indeed, Are not the Father and the Son *another and another in Person*? of which *Persons* the Prophets always speak, but of *Substances* never. And is not *Justin Martyr's* plain Exposition of these Words, according to the Sense above given, without a Syllable of any such extravagant Reasoning, better Evidence of the antient Exposition of this Text, than that of any Modern

Dialog.

cum

Tryph. p.

289, 290.

whatsoever? But this is rather an Instance of false *Athanasian Inferences* from, than of direct *Misinterpretations* of the Texts of Scripture; so I leave it. However, it would be very easy to go on in the same manner as before: and shew, how the *Athanasian* Interpretation of Texts is almost universally unsupported by the antient Interpretation of the first Christians. But that would render this Preface too large; and I have been in good measure prevented therein, both by Dr. *Clarke*, on several Occasions; and by Dr. *Whitby*, in a distinct Pamphlet written upon this very Subject: neither of

whose

whose Facts are capable of any direct Answer by the *Athanasians*. However,

P.84, &c.

Pro.viii.
22.

Apoc. iii.
14.

I must now, My Lord, beg leave to mention two or three Texts, that were alleged by me against the *Athanasians*, in the particular Point of the Creation of the Son ; and examine what Your Lordship has to say for your own, and the *Athanasian* Sense of them, either from Antiquity, or modern Criticism. In *Prov. viii. 22.* we have these Words, from the *Greek* Version, ever and only used by the first Christians ; *The Lord created me, the Beginning of his Ways, for his Works.* And elsewhere our Lord is called, with a plain Allusion to the same Text, *The Beginning of the Creation of God.* Now in order to discover this real Meaning of the *Beginning of the Creation of God*, in the *Apocalypse*, I had observ'd, in my Letter to Your Lordship, that *Ἀρχὴ*, with a genitive Case, as here, was never used actively, for the *Head* or *Governor*, in all the New Testament ; which yet is Your Lordship's and the *Athanasian* Exposition of this Text : These Examples, no fewer than thirteen in number, were certainly better Guides in this parallel Text of the same New Testament, than any others from *Plato*, *Aristotle*, or even *Clement of Alexandria* himself. But Your Lordship takes no manner of notice of them at all ; tho indeed the most literal and obvious Sense every where, and that which is most agreeable to the Parallels in the same Age, and in the same Circumstances, has certainly the best Title to be esteem'd the true one : especially when the visible Allusion, which is here made to the other known Text in the *Proverbs*, determines it the same way ; and conspires to assure us, that Christ, in his highest Nature, was created, was the *Beginning*, the first Instance of that creative Power of the Father : and when the whole Current of Antiquity cite that place of the *Proverbs* in that most obvious Acceptation, who indeed seem never to have heard of any other. Words may possibly signify very many things, but they do really, in particular Places, usually signify but *One thing* ; and that one thing here, by much the superior and most antient Evidence, is this, that the *Son of God was the first Being that God created* : and this in order to the making use of his Ministration for creating the rest of God's Works ; as the antient Christians still appear to have understood them.

Let

Let
where
whole C
first Ee
Your L
born, i
eight i
as befo
fisted
Sense :
and is
young
strued
Lord,
and p
use of
of the
as con
least
Interp
all str
being
clar'd
before
ating
we co
am no
were
be ;
the
from
they
Mont
My L
the D
he th
Mont
fmal
ceive
Expo
ward
Cent
he th
Cent

Let us now proceed to that other eminent Text; *P.89, &c.* where Christ is called expressly, *The First-born of the whole Creation*; i. e. in the most obvious Sense, the very *first Being which God created*: as I had also observ'd to Your Lordship from the Meaning of the Term *First-born*, in all the other Places of the New Testament, eight in number. Now here Your Lordship is pleas'd, as before, to omit those Parallels, so far as I had insisted upon them, and to hunt about for a *figurative Sense*: And because the *First-born* is usually the Heir, and is suppos'd to have a sort of Dominion over his younger Brethren, you desire the Text may be construed in that Sense only. But what occasion, My Lord, for the *figurative Sense* of a Text, which is clear and plain in the *literal*? and is accordingly often made use of by the antient Christians, till about the middle of the fourth Century, in their very Creeds and Prayers, as containing a known Christian Doctrine; without the least sign, that I ever observ'd, of any such *figurative* Interpretation whatsoever. Nor is the Coherence at *V.16, 17.* all strained in this way, as Your Lordship pretends; it *P.92.* being proper, for certain, that the Son should be declar'd to be the *Image of the Invisible God, and created before all other Beings*, before his Instrumentality in creating all the rest could be understood or believed. If we could but once prevail for such fair *Referees*, as I am now proposing; and if all the antient Expositions were set over against every Text, as they then ought to be; the *Athanasians* would soon be ashamed before all the World, for so often turning those antient Texts from their natural Sense, in and near the Ages when they were written, to Senses wholly unheard of till *Montanus*, and rarely heard of till *Athanasius*. I say still, My Lord, and I desire it may be always observ'd, till the Days, *first of Montanus*, and *then of Athanasius*. For he that reads, with due Care, the excellent *History of Montanism*, and particularly *Tertullian*, from which no small part of that History is taken; and does not perceive a *Change* in the Faith, Worship, Practices, and Expositions of Scripture, among Christians, even towards the end of the *second*, and former part of the *third* Century, *begun by Montanus* and his Followers: And he that reads the Ecclesiastical History of the *fourth* Century, and does not see that *Change* openly compleated by

by *Atbanasius* and his Followers ; may, I should think, read the Histories of the Protestant Reformation, begun by *John Wicliff*, in the fourteenth Century, and compleated by *Luther*, in the sixteenth ; and yet a little scruple to confess, that there was *any great Change* made in such Matters all that while.

VII. This Method of *Referees*, My Lord, would prevent another common and notorious piece of knavish Policy, which Writers of Controversy are almost every where guilty of ; and that is, To endeavour to prove or disprove that by remote *Evasions*, and novel *Consequences*, from Passages of Scripture, or of Antiquity, where they can find no direct Testimonies ; nay, not seldom, where the Testimonies are expressly against them. This is properly the *Art or Mystery of Controversy* ; that when the Disputants, like cunning Pleaders at the Bar, find that the Witnesses themselves on the other side are too many, and too plain to be confronted ; they may, by artful *Evasions*, and subtle *Inferences*, amuse and persuade their weak Auditors, to give them a Verdict notwithstanding. And what Work has been made with the Scriptures and antient Authors, by all sorts of Writers of Controversy, in this way of New and Remote *Evasions* and *Inferences*, the whole learned World well knows. How do the *Baronius's* and the *Bellarmines*, the *Souths* and the *Sherlocks*, the *Bulls* and the *Waterlands*, torture and torment the plain, honest, and undesigning Testimonies they are concern'd with ; till the clearest Words in the World become almost unintelligible ? Thus, when our Lord blamed one that called him *Good Master*, and said, somewhat sharply, *Why callest thou me Good ? there is none Good but One, that is God ; or, God, even my Father who is in Heaven ;* as *Clement of Alexandria* either read or paraphras'd the Place, than which 'tis hardly possible to suppose Words stronger against the *Atbanasian* Doctrine, that the *Goodness* of the Son is *equal* to that of the Father : Yet are we by no means allow'd to believe what our Saviour so solemnly assures us of ; but novel *Evasions* and *Distinctions* here, and remote *Inferences* from other Places are invented, to divert the Reader from attending thereto ; till the express and literal Sense of our Saviour's Declaration becomes, in plain Terms, no better than *Heretical*. Thus also, when our Lord, both by the Nature of his Reasoning,

Mat. xix.

16, 17.

Mark x.

17, 18.

Luke

xviii. 18.

Vid. Mill.

in loc.

soning, and the Expressness of his Affirmation, assures us, in another place, that *the Father is greater than all* ; Joh. x. 29 and in particular, *greater than He* : the *Athanasians*, by some subtile Distinctions, and remote Inferences from other Places, declare the direct contrary, that they are both *equal* : and to say the very same thing that Christ did in almost any other words than he said it ; (which indeed they do not always care to call by so hard a Name) will also, in the same manner, be deemed no better than *Heretical*. Thus also, when, in some other Texts, our Lord seems to try whether any words *can possibly* be express enough to prevent an *Athanasian* Inference against them, and assures us, that *of the Day and Hour*, Mat.xxiv. of the future Judgment, *knew no one* ; *no not the Angels* 36. *in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father* ; nay, *but the Father only* : And when it appears, by his own words, 32. immediately before his final Ascension, that even the time for the Restoration of *Israel*, or when the *Kingdom* would be restored to that People, was still *put in the Father's own power* ; nay, when it appears still later, by the *Apocalypse*, that Christ was not able to *Unseal the Sealed Book* of the Divine Providence, till the Merits of his Death and Intercession had obtain'd that great Privilege from the Father, of knowing and revealing them : And when, after all, every single Writer of Antiquity, Catholic or *Montanist*, that mentions these Texts, or this Subject, plainly agrees to the literal *Eusebian* Interpretation, without the least syllable to the contrary, till the Days of *Athanasius* : viz. ' That Christ, in his highest Capacity, did not really *know the Day and Hour* of that future Judgment, by any absolutely Omniscient Nature of his own ; but that he waited till the Father was pleased to reveal it to him : ' While, I say, all this is the plain Fact ; as I have elsewhere proved at large, in one of the Papers herewith sent to Your Lordship ; yet will not the *Athanasians* give us leave to believe our Saviour in this Case ; but by several novel Evasions, Inferences, and Distinctions, will overbear us, that He did originally *know the Day and Hour* of the future Judgment, as well as his Father, notwithstanding. Thus also does Your Lordship deal with me, all over Your Answer to my Letter. Where, instead of a nice Enquiry into all the original Testimonies against the Coeternity of the Son and Holy Spirit, which

Mat.xxiv.

36.

Mar. xiii.

32.

Acts i. 7.

Apoc. i. 1.

—v. 9.

Orig. of

the Sabel.

and Atha-

nas. Doct.

p.94-101.

I had produced ; and fairly balancing them all with those which may possibly be supposed on the other side ; which was what I properly begg'd of Your Lordship to do : You select a few of those Testimonies ; to see if they may not have somewhat pick'd out of them, either in the Nicety of my Translation, or in the antecedent and consequent Context, that by Art, and Evasion, and Consequence, might amuse the Reader, and divert him from the Impartial Comparison of the Original Evidence itself. Now as to this Method, My Lord, of drawing *modern Consequences* from antient Books ; such, I mean, as are Strangers to the Times and Circumstances when those Books were written ; It has, for certain, brought on or supported no small part of those notorious Heresies, that Idolatry, Persecution, Popery, and Antichristianism, with which the Church of Christ has been afflicted ever since the Days of our Blessed Saviour. Whence came *Simon Magus's*, *Valentinus's*, *Cerdon's*, *Marcion's*, *Montanus's*, *Marcus's*, *Sabellius's*, and *Marcellus's* Heresies ? They were either first deriv'd from, or mainly supported afterward by such *modern Deductions*. Whence came *St. Austin's* strange Scheme of *Original Sin*, of absolute *Election* and *Reprobation* ? Whence came Popish Prayers for the Dead, Purgatory, Worship of Images, of Angels and Saints ; with the rest of their Follies ? Do the Scriptures, the antient Creeds or Liturgies, any where directly command or exemplify such Doctrines or Practices ? No. But *modern Inferences* from original Texts and Testimonies support them. In short, the *Misinterpreting* Scripture, and the most Primitive Authors, join'd to this way of *Inferring* what we please from them, have been the grand Sources of such Corruptions ; while the Vulgar are made to believe, that by such *Consequences*, all those weak and prejudicate Opinions of their Leaders, which have no direct Foundation either in Scripture or Antiquity, may be drawn from both Scripture and Antiquity. Just so did the *Rabbi's* and *Scribes* among the *Jews*, in the Days of our Saviour ; they made void the plain Commands of God himself, deliver'd expressly in the Pentateuch, by the like modern and human Interpretations and Deductions, derived commonly, by Tradition, from some noted *Rabbi*, who perhaps was hardly dead in the Days of their

their own Grandfathers. Nor need any modern Party, My Lord, much care what the original Books of Christianity themselves say to their Disadvantage; while they secure this Authority of *Interpretation* and *Inference* to themselves upon all Occasions. And thus indeed does Your Lordship retire, as do the rest of the *Athanasians*, from direct *Affertions* and *Testimonies*, to remote, weak, and novel *Evasions* and *Inferences*; of no weight but among the *Athanasians*, and generally unheard of before the very Days of *Athanasius*: till the Reader loses sight of the original Passages themselves, about this grand Point of the *Coeternity*. And just thus does Dr. *Knight* with the same Texts and Testimonies; whose Number and Strength he is so well aware of, that he retires to the Strong-hold of an *Evasion*, unheard of, perhaps, till his own Days. He hopes he may be here allow'd to coin a *third Nature* in Christ, besides the *Divine* and *Human*, with respect to which he may be called a *Made Being*, and a *Creature*: This he stiles, *A created intellectual Nature, which Christ is supposed by* Confid. some to have assumed at the Beginning of the Creation, as p. 55. the First-Fruits of it; and then all my Texts and Testimonies are to be of no value against him. Thus also, when Bishop *Bull* himself was sorely press'd with the Sect. II. express Testimonies of *Origen* against *Solemn Prayer*, C.9. §.15. or the highest direct Worship being offered to Christ, p. 120, in his Book against *Celsus*; which yet are not one quarter so express, as is his *large Discourse* against it in his 121. Book of *Prayer*: he hopes to avoid the whole Force of such clear Passages, by first distinguishing Christ into his *Divine*, and into his *Mediatorial* Nature or Capacity: then by distinguishing his *Divine* Nature or Capacity, into his *absolutely* Divine Nature or Capacity; and into that Divine Nature or Capacity, whereby he is *God of God*, or the *Son of God*. And by such-like Distinctions, part of them unheard of, I dare say, till the Bishop's own Days, is he enabled to get clear of the plainest Testimonies in the World against him. Accordingly Your Lordship tries a Comparison between some Passages of the Old Testament, with others of the New; as do Dr. *Waterland*, Dr. *Knight*, and others: that by a Side-wind you may infer that *Unity of two Persons in the same Substance*, of which neither the Old nor the New do directly say one syllable: And then

comes Your Lordship, and by a still remoter Inference, collects from that *Unity of Substance* this real *Coeternity*; which neither the Old nor the New Testament directly favour in any one Text whatsoever: and all this without being able to shew that any one Catholick Writer made any such Collection till the Days of *Athanasius*. Our Judges are here much more wise and upright, who, altho they patiently hear such subtile Pleas, and Distinctions, and Inferences made by the Counsel on both sides, as well as they do the real Records and Witnesses themselves; yet when they *sum up the Evidence*, and *direct the Jury*, they lay aside all such Amusements, and confine themselves wholly to those real *Records and Witnesses*: and by them alone do they come to a *final Determination*. And this indeed has been my Method, ever since I fell into this way of Examination. And all that take the same Course, will, I believe, at last come to the same Conclusion in the Point before us; and will see that this *Coeternity*, if we go only by the original Records and Witnesses, will thence appear to be utterly *indefensible*.

VIII. Another great Reason, my Lord, why I dislike the way of writing Books of Controversy, and desire the more impartial way of a *Reference*, is this; that the former Method is plainly *endless*, and so far diverts the Mind from seeing and weighing the proper Evidence itself, that an honest Reader can hardly ever come to a satisfactory Determination. This is a Case so common, that all the Christian World is sensible of it, and groans under it: *Papists* write Books of Controversy against *Protestants*, and *Protestants* against *Papists*; *Lutherans* against *Calvinists*, and *Calvinists* against *Lutherans*; *Athanasians* against *Socinians*, and *Socinians* against *Athanasians*; the Bishop of Bangor and his Friends, against Dr. *Snape* and his Friends; and Dr. *Snape* and his Friends, against the Bishop of Bangor and his Friends: and this, on both sides, usually, in so artful, cautious, and plausible a manner, that each Party conclude the Writers on their Side have got the Victory; while the more cool and sober Enquirers, who impartially consider what is said on both Sides, do much oftener see that they are *both in the wrong*, than properly know where the *real Truth* lies between them. This was my own Case, My Lord, in earnest, when I was a Scholar

Scholar at the University of *Cambridge*, at the time of the Revolution : When by my Education, and the Notions of that Church and Faith in which I was *bred* (not *baptized*, as Your Lordship mistakes ; for the *Athanasians* themselves have yet not been here so wicked, as to *baptize* into any particular Church, or particular Faith, but into the Christian Church, and into the common Creed :) I say of that Church and Religion in which I was *bred*, was dissatisfied about Submission to that Government, which was then setting over us. Pamphlets came out then in great Plenty on both sides ; and some of them I perus'd, in order to obtain Satisfaction, one way or another, before the Oath should be tendered to me. But I found no Satisfaction in point of Conscience, by such Books : The best Disputant made the best Shew ; till his Adversary, perhaps almost as subtle as himself, demolished his Scheme, and set up another ; which was also, it may be, demolished by Replies and Rejoinders in its turn : So that the Prejudices of Education, Party, or Interest, commonly cast the Scale, as to Persuasion. I thereupon found it necessary to change my Method of Enquiry, and to look over the Bible itself, to which both Sides us'd to appeal ; and that with all that Sagacity, Honesty, and Impartiality I was Master of. The Result was sudden and clear ; that the Submission of private Subjects to those whom the Providence of God, and the publick Election, Recognition, or Consent of a Nation, at any time, set over them, was a very plain Duty of Religion ; and that the indefeisible Rights of particular Families, without that Consent, was a groundless Notion, and unknown to the whole Bible : which latter Point especially, I, long after, more exactly examined, in the same way, upon occasion of my Lord Bishop of *Bangor's Preservative* ; as my *Scripture-Politicks* will bear witness. Having therefore, My Lord, in the former Instance, obtain'd that Satisfaction in this way of Enquiry, which Books of Controversy could not afford me, I still retain'd the same afterward, and still found the like Satisfaction thereby, upon the several other Occasions of my Life. And as, I hope, no Dread of *Imprisonment*, *Stoning*, or *Burning*, with which Your Lordship's *Postscript* seems to terrify me, will ever make me afraid honestly and openly to embrace the sacred Truths

P. 17, 101.

P. 159.

of

of Christianity, now -I have *satisfied* my self about them : so do I believe I shall never see Reason to change the manner of those Enquiries, whereby I have so often, and so fully reap'd that *Satisfaction*. Nor would Your Lordship, I dare say, yourself, easily desert such an honest and upright Method, if you had once try'd it, with the like Success and Pleasure that I have done. But indeed the modern way of Dispute and Controversy is much more entertaining and diverting: 'Tis therefore no great wonder that it has been so universal in these latter Ages ; though it rather puzzles and confounds, than truly profits and satisfies Mankind ; as daily Experience does abundantly demonstrate. Nor indeed, My Lord, is the *Charges*, and *Tediousness*, and *Bulkiness* of Books of Controversy, a small Objection against that Method. To say nothing here, but with relation to my Letter, and Your Lordship's Answer ; What Volumes would this one Dispute, about the *Coeternity*, amount to, at the rate Your Lordship has continued it ? I wrote a small Letter of forty one Pages ; Your Answer to the lesser part of it is already one hundred sixty three Pages ; and when finish'd, in the same way, would be four hundred Pages. Should I go on by the like way, my Reply could not be much less than five or six hundred Pages : and if Your Lordship made a *Rejoinder*, it would easily be a thousand ; till we should, on both sides, find neither Buyers nor Readers ; and indeed should deserve to have neither : since 'tis plain, that a few careful Reviews of the original Evidence, which lies generally in a short Compass, would afford every sincere Enquirer tenfold that Degree of Conviction, which all our *Pleas* and *Answers*, *Rejoinders* and *Replications* could possibly afford them. These are the plain Reasons, My Lord, why I decline making a direct and particular *Reply* to Your Lordship's *Answer* to my Letter ; and why I so earnestly press for a fair *Reference*, that so Christian People may be no longer impos'd upon by any Sect, or any cunning Disputants whosoever. That in case I, and those of my Mind, be in the wrong ; the Christian World may authentickly know that we are so, and our Errors may be immediately discover'd, and a Stop put to them ; which, on that Supposition, I heartily wish for, and desire. But that if the *Athanasians*, and a-

mong

mong them Your Lordship, be in the wrong, (and You know, My Lord, You are not *more infallible* than We) which at present I fully believe, the World may, in the same authentick manner, know You are so; and Your Errors may, by this Method, be discover'd, and a Stop put to them: which, on that Supposition, I presume Your Lordship, and all that are honest on Your Side, will also heartily wish for and desire.

And here, My Lord, it would be well worth Your Enquiry, how it has come to pass, that the *Athanasian* Disputants have alter'd the whole State of this Controversy, from that fair way in which both Dr. *Clarke* and my self had at first put it? And why Dr. *Bennet*, Dr. *Waterland*, Dr. *Knight*, Dr. *Mangey*, and the rest, do not go on in that honest Method we had begun; I mean, that of setting before the Reader all the Sacred and Primitive Evidence, all the original Texts and Testimonies, that immediately concern'd the Subjects we were upon, in order to the passing a sure and well-grounded Judgment upon them. It would be also well worth the Enquiry, why those that undertook to vindicate the Lord Bishop of *London's* Letter to his Diocess, about the antient *Doxologies*, did not do as I did, and produce some considerable number of original and well-attested *Doxologies*; wherein, according to the present Doctrine and Practice, the *Anti-Nicene* Churches and Fathers gave *equal Glory* to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit? And why, instead of this, which alone could effectually vindicate his Lordship and the present Churches, those Writers still lie at catch, to see if they cannot now and then find a too general Expression, or Assertion, or some Inaccuracies in the Versions of a few Passages in our Books, in order to make a Shew of saying something, and thereby to divert Men from the plain and clear Evidence we generally bring from the Bible, and the rest of the old Christian Records, for the Support of our Assertions. Why have we not at least some *One Antient Creed* produc'd, among those many now extant, that contains the *Athanasian* Doctrine of the Trinity? And at least some *One Antient Prayer*, among so many now extant, directed to the Son, at least, if not to the Holy Spirit also, as to a Person *Co-equal* and *Coeternal* with the Father? Why have we not some competent Number of Original Texts and
Testi-

Defence
of Que-
ries, p.
250, 258,
259, 260,
& alibi
passim.

Testimonies alleg'd, that directly assure us, that the Three Divine Persons are *One God*, or *the One God* of the Christian Religion; and that this Doctrine is a *great Mystery*, not to be examin'd into farther, but believ'd; as the Moderns so frequently and positively affirm? At least, why have we not some clear and plain Intimations given us in the Bible, or some of the other old Christian Records, that tho the Son and Holy Spirit are *tacitly included* under the *One God the Father*, as Dr. *Waterland* expresses it; yet was it no way prudent or safe for those Writers to tell us so much; but they were still, it seems, obliged to speak directly, as if the *Person of the Father alone was the one true God*? Which way of Reasoning indeed, seems to me prodigiously weak and sceptical; since we can, upon this Hypothesis, never be secure of the true Sense of any Article of Faith whatsoever. It being, for certain, equally supposable, that the Sacred Writers might be oblig'd to speak as they do, though they did not mean as they speak, in any other Article of the Creed; as it seems they were oblig'd to do in the first and most fundamental Article of all. What I shall say to such wild Schemes, is this, That 'twill be well for the Authors at the Great Day, if they be in earnest, in such Cases: since what they say seems to me generally so weak and trifling, that I have much ado to have Charity enough to suppose, that they *really believe* themselves in such their Apologies. Nay, it would well deserve the Inquiry, why the same Dr. *Waterland* so positively and universally affirms, that *all the Ante-Nicene Fathers*, *all Ante-Nicene Antiquity* in general, even *Origen* himself, are on the Side of the *Athanasians*; when it is so evident, and, I am inform'd, he does not deny it himself, that till after the Council of *Nice*, not one of those Authors do properly and fully *speak like the Athanasians*; and when he every where so industriously avoids the Introduction of almost any of their words, in their entire native Simplicity; or otherwise than in his own way, and as guarded by his own Explications and Comments perpetually: which is, as if the Courts in *Westminster-Hall* should order no Witnesses to be heard themselves; but that what the Counsel should say they can witness, should be alone taken as their original Depositions. It would farther deserve Your Lordship's

serious

serious Enquiry, why *Du Pin*, *Dr. Waterland*, *Dr. Mangey*, and the other *Athanasians*, do so often say, that the Texts and Testimonies we produce against them, instead of *naturally denoting, truly signifying, really meaning*, as they explain them, at the time when they were written; which is our way of Allegation; *maybe* orthodoxly expounded; *may* have an *Athanasian* Sense put upon them; are *capable* of a good Sense, upon what they call the *Catholic*, but ought to call the *Athanasian Hypothesis*; are *not incapable* of the Church's Interpretation, or the like. Is not this sort of Language, My Lord, an evident Confession, that though the natural, obvious, and easy Sense of such Texts, and what an unbiass'd Critick would certainly take to be their genuine meaning, be against their Expositions; yet are those Texts still to be taken in any *possible Sense* that the Necessities of the present Church do require? to whose Tribunal they are ultimately to be subject, and by whose Interpretation they must finally be determined. And how very far these *may-be's*, these *possible Senses* will carry our Disputers for modern Orthodoxy, any one may easily suppose; and some of the Instances already given will distinctly exemplify. Nor indeed do I believe that I have myself, as frank, and open, and explicite as I have ever been with the Publick in declaring my Opinions, very often used Expressions more *directly heretical*, in the modern Notion of Heresy, or more *incapable of an Orthodox Interpretation*, than many of those used by our Saviour himself, his Apostles, and their Successors, upon the same Occasions. I only desire the Reader, for a Specimen of *Dr. Waterland's* Abilities this way, to peruse the original Evidence I have given, to prove, that Christ did *not* really *know the Day and Hour* of the future Judgment, till it was revealed to him by his Father: And *Origen's* own express Passages, in his Book against *Celsus*, to say nothing of the large Discourse in his Book of *Prayer* against offering solemn Prayer directly to the Son (all which Evidence the Doctor reconciles to the *Athanasian* Scheme, by the way of a *possible Interpretation*) in my *True Origin of the Sabellian and Athanasian Doctrines of the Trinity*, p. 94---101. and p. 107---110. to which I refer Your Lordship for Satisfaction. Above all, it would deserve Your Lordship's Enquiry, at this time, why the same *Dr. Waterland*,

P. 207,
197. &
alibi pas-
sim.

who has too nicely read the Scriptures, and the other Primitive Authors, to be ignorant of those numerous and evident Testimonies for the *Creation* of the Son by the Father, which I have produc'd, bears the World in hand, that the Antients *no where assert that the Son of God is a Creature*; but *almost every where, at least implicitly and consequentially, agree, that he was not created*: contrary to Your Lordship's own Concessions; and to express Fact, direct Evidence, and very numerous Quotations, produced from those Antients in my Letter. Nay, if I might presume to speak so plainly to Your Lordship, why do You, Yourself, so industriously seek out lesser Occasions of quarrelling with me, about a few small Inaccuracies in my Versions, or the like incidental Matters, in case You can directly confront my original Witnesses, by *more, and stronger*, on the other Side? The Question is not, whether I be not now and then mistaken? but, whether the Primitive Christian Evidence, *against the Coeternity* of the Son and Holy Spirit, be not much stronger than the Evidence *for it*? which main Point is very little affected by any such smaller Mistakes or Inaccuracies whatsoever. Accordingly I beg this Favour of Your Lordship, that You will please to review all those original Texts and Testimonies, as they now stand, upon a Re-examination, and the Admission of several of Your Lordship's own Corrections; and to consider fairly, like an upright Judge, whether the Evidence on my Side be not still *vastly superior* to that on the other? In short, it deserves to be well consider'd, whether we ought not to suppose, that the constant and obstinate Avoidance or Refusal of the most upright and unexceptionable Method in the World, I mean that of laying first all the original Passages, in their native Simplicity, before the Reader, before they reason from them, by the modern *Athanasians*, be not a sure Sign that they despair of carrying their Point that way: and that, by consequence, they plainly see, that the *Athanasian* Doctrine, without the usual Arts and Tricks of the Writers of Controversy, cannot possibly be supported any longer. As to my own Belief and Practice, I confess, my Lord, that I dare not venture to govern myself by such ways of Reasoning, by such Distinctions, Evasions, and Deductions, as our latter Controversy-Writers make use of; but always insist

on

on direct Sacred and Primitive Testimonies; or at least on such Inferences as are plain at first sight, or such as were made from them, in or very near to the Times when the Authors themselves wrote. I shall, I think, never be brought to believe Transubstantiation, or Purgatory, or Prayers to the Dead, or Worship of Images, of Angels, and Saints, by such modern *Papish* Deductions: I shall, I think, never be persuaded to believe the Doctrine of *Original Sin*, or of unconditional *Election and Reprobation*, by such modern *Calvinist* Deductions: Nor shall I, as I hope, be ever induced to forsake the natural Import of the antient *Rule of Faith*, as contained in the Baptismal, and other antient Creeds, and believe the *Athanasian Creed* in its stead; nor indeed be so bold as to offer up Prayers, or Doxologies, directly to the Holy Spirit at all: or even to the Son, as to a Person *cœqual* and *coeternal* with the Father, by such modern *Athanasian* Deductions. Nay, I think, I shall hardly dare to baptize any uncatechiz'd Infant, as did the *Africans*, and they alone, in the Days even of *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, by such Deductions. In short, I shall, I hope, ever endeavour to believe and to practise, what, upon the best Examination of Facts I can make, I shall discover to have been the genuine Doctrines, and Worship, and Practices of our Blessed Saviour himself, of his Holy Apostles, and their Companions and Successors, before any such *pernicious* and *fatal* Method of *altering the Christian Religion*, by human Deductions, human Distinctions, and human Evasions ever came into the Church; and this in opposition to all other contradictory or Antichristian Authority whatsoever: For whether it be right, in the sight of God, to hearken unto Men, more than to God, speaking by his only-begotten Son, judge ye. For I cannot but think myself oblig'd to believe, and to speak the things that I have seen and heard from himself, and his immediate Followers; whatsoever the present *Athanasians* shall say to the contrary. Nor am I yet fully satisfied, My Lord, that either the truly learned *Papists* or *Calvinists*, or *Pædobaptists*, or *Athanasians*, do really believe, that, in Fact, the Apostles did themselves ever practise upon their Principles, in any of these Cases.

But now, My Lord, I cannot conclude this Preface, without freely acknowledging, that, in one Point, I am

obliged directly and plainly to *reply* to what Your Lordship alleges against me ; and that is, concerning the true original Sense of some very antient Expressions, concerning the *Coeternity* of the Son ; which indeed I esteem much the principal thing in Your whole Answer. And as Your Lordship puts it fairly home to me, so shall I make as fair and as home a Reply thereto. And as your Lordship is there so just, as to own, ' That ' there are some Passages in the antient Authors, quoted ' by me, that seem to countenance my Doctrine ; ' so do You affirm, ' That it cannot with any colour of Truth be ' denied, but that some of those Authors, at least *Irenaeus*, ' *Eusebius*, and the Presbyters and Deacons of *Alexan-* ' *dria*, by me quoted, do, by my own Confession, say, ' That the Generation of the Son was *αἰδιον*, *Eternal* ; ' that he was *αὐαρχον*, *beginningless*, ' and at *all times* with the Father ; elder than *all Times*, ' and *all Ages* ; that he subsisted from *endless Ages* ; ' that he reigned with his Father *from beginningless Ages*, ' and that God begat him *before eternal Times*.'

P. 50.

Ibid. &
p. 54.

P. 55.

Comment
on the Ep.
of S. John,
p. 113.

Now here Your Lordship asks me very pertinently, ' Whether there be words in any Language to express ' the Doctrine you are contending for, more plainly and ' fully than those which I my self have furnish'd You ' with ? ' Now here, My Lord, before I directly reply to this direct Question, I shall add another very authentick Testimony before omitted, but now added ; I mean that of *Philo*, concerning the *Jewish* Notion of the Antiquity of the Word of God, in the Days of the Apostles ; who indeed expressly calls him, ' *ὁ λόγος*, God's *Eternal Word*. And this Testimony is to be the more nicely taken notice of here, because it was not improbably from this *Philo*, that those learned Christians, who afterwards used that very word, till the days of *Athanasius*, took it ; as they did his Philosophy also, relating to this matter. But then Your Lordship must give me leave, by way of Reply, to say, That although one of Your Lordship's Station and Studies, which have not permitted You to converse much with the antient Authors themselves ; and who have all along found those *Greek* Expressions turned into *Latin* or *English*, by the *Athanasian* Translators, in such Terms, as in our Days, and according to the modern Philosophy, would obviously denote a real *Eternity*, or even *Coeternity*

with

with the Father, may easily be excus'd in so judging : Yet that those learned *Athanasian* Criticks, who either must necessarily, or might readily discover their true Importance, in those elder Centuries, and know that they did not then so signify, are not so easily to be excused. The Philosophy of the three or four first Centuries, excepting that of the gross *Arians* ; as appears by *Philo*, the Author of the *Recognitions*, both cited in this Edition of my *Letter*, and many others, was this ; That the Supreme Being was himself far above, and beyond all Substance, all Comprehension, all Ages, and Eternities whatsoever, was always immutably and unalterably the same. That before all proper or intelligible Time, and conceivable Duration, but only when himself pleased, that Supreme Being became a Father, by the Generation of his Son ; and afterward became a Creator and Lord, by creating other Creatures that were to be subject to him : but at what Point or Period in that immense Eternity, or how long before the Beginning of the World He begat his Son, if any such Words may be allow'd in this case, no subordinate Being whatsoever could possibly determine. For they esteemed what we call Eternity, or Time, or the Ages, or the Beginning of the Ages, as entirely subject to Creation themselves ; and took the words of the Author to the *Hebrews*, above mentioned, in the literal Sense ; that those Ages or Eternities were made, under the Father, by the Ministration of the Son : while the Supreme Father himself was not limited by Ages, or Eternities ; as the *Apostolical Constitutions* speak. That these Ages, or Eternities, or Eternal Times, began either with, or rather after the Creation of the World itself, to which they wholly belong'd : that no Ages, no Eternities, no Then, no Now, nor any other Word that we use about Time, or Duration, could be truly imagined before this made Time and Duration. That therefore it was too bold, if not absurd, to say, *ὅτε ἔκ ἑν*, There was an Age, or a Time, or a Beginning, when the Son did not exist ; because all such Ages, all such Time, all such Beginning, was part of that very Creation, which the Son, as the Instrument of the Father, did himself create. That therefore the Father might be said to be ever or always a Father ; and the Son to have been ever or always with him : That the Son's Origin was to be suppos'd beyond and before all Ages, all Time, all Beginning ;

viii. 15.

ginning; was in this Sense ἀίδιον, such as had ever been; αἰώνιον, or πρὸ αἰώνιον, or πρὸ αἰώνων, or πρὸ πάντων αἰώνων, or πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων; *Eternal*, or *before Eternity*, or *before Eternities*, or *before all Eternities*, or *before Eternal Times*; if I may so express the original Phrases in our Language: All which *Eternities* yet commenced but with the Beginning of the World, and were not pretended sufficient to denote the *immutable and absolute Eternity* of the Unbegotten Being himself. This I take to be the true State of this Notion and Language in general, during the three first Centuries, and somewhat longer. Now that such Expressions as these did not then properly mean *Eternal*, in the strict Sense, or *Coeternal with the Father*, there is very great reason to believe. For,

See my
Letter,
under these
Authors;
and my
Antient
Monum.
passim.

(1.) All that speak distinctly of this Matter, at the same time that they use these Expressions, do agree, That tho the Son was *before* all Time, and all Ages; yet was he *after* his Father: That the very Notion of Father and Son ever supposed that *Priority* and *Posteriority*, and could not be conceived without it.

(2.) The very same Authors who use these Expressions, do also not seldom directly affirm, that God *made* or *created* Him; that He was a *Being Created*, and a *Being Made*. So that, unless we suppose, that they believed that a *Creature* might be, and actually was *Coeternal* and *Coeternal with its Creator*, (which *Origen* indeed, and he alone of all the Antients, has been suppos'd to have thought not absolutely impossible :) they could not believe this real *Eternity* or *Coeternity*.

(3.) Those Authors that speak thus, when they join other Words to these, by way of Explication, do, as well as the rest, frequently let us know that they did not intend by them to compare the Antiquity of the Son with that of the Father, but with that of the World only. This is the Case, as to the Texts contained in my Collection out of the Bible, as well as the Passages in Christian Antiquity. Thus *Solomon*—*Or ever the Earth was*—*when there were no Depths*—*when there were no Fountains*—*before the Mountains*—*before the Hills*. *John*—*Before the World was*. *Son of Sirach*—*Before the World began*. *Phile*—*Before the World began*—*antienter than the World*. *Peter*—*Begotten before the rest*. *Hermas*—*More antient than any Creature*.

Justin

Justin-
and the
the Fir
Creatur
ation of
Illustra
always
While
ble wo
ter tha
(4.)
Illuttr
Words
(if I r
a qua
when
he eve
trine.
fines t
the F
serves
before
He al
use at
of the
ing;
lent t
low'd
(5.)
χρὸν
clear
Auth
Deac
but o
Alexa
Etern
give
the S
Fath
hear
nicat
the
Doct
on th

Justin.—*Before the Creatures—before the Morning-Star, and the Moon—before all the Creatures—before the Sun—the First-born of all the Creatures—absolutely before all the Creatures.* And *Lactantius—Before God set about the Creation of the World.* Nor does any of them use an higher Illustration than *Eusebius* himself, in one place—*Being always with his Father, as Light with the Luminous Body.* While yet the same *Eusebius* esteem'd the more tolerable word $\alpha\iota\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$, *Eternal*, when taken strictly, no better than *Heretical*; as we shall see immediately. For,

(4.) The very same *Eusebius*, who used that highest Illustration of all, and ventured upon both the highest Words, $\alpha\iota\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and $\alpha\varpi\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\varsigma$, *Eternal* and *Beginningless*; (if I may so improperly render them :) when used in a qualified Sense, of the Antiquity of the Son; yet when he perceived them taken in a strict Acceptation, he ever declared his Abhorrence of such *Heretical Doctrine*. Thus, excepting one or two places, he ever confines the highest Term $\alpha\varpi\alpha\rho\chi\omicron\varsigma$, *Beginningless*, to God the Father alone; as the most Learned *Monfaucon* observes, in his exact Account of this *Eusebius's* Opinions, before his Edition of the Commentary on the *Psalms*. He also observes, that when *Marcellus* appears to him to use $\alpha\iota\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$, *Eternal*, in a strict Sense, for the Coeternity of the Son, he openly accuses him of *Heresy* for so doing; and affirms, that if it be so taken, it was equivalent to *Unbegotten*: which all the Christian World allow'd to be intirely *Heretical*. Cap. 6.

(5.) Most of those who use $\alpha\iota\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$, *Eternal*, or $\pi\epsilon\acute{\rho}\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota\ \alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}\iota\omicron\upsilon$, *before Eternal Times*; do plainly and clearly deny the Coeternity. I instance in *Philo*, the Author of the *Recognitions*, *Novatian*, the Presbyters and Deacons of *Alexandria*, and *Eusebius*. And as to the last but one of these, I mean the Presbyters and Deacons of *Alexandria*, who use that very high Expression, *Before Eternal Times*; 'tis very strange Your Lordship does not give them up: since they, in express Terms, affirm, that the Son is not $\alpha\iota\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$, *Eternal*, nor *Coeternal*; and that the Father was *before* him: nay, that they had themselves heard their Bishop *Alexander* [he that first excommunicated the *Arians*] preach that last Doctrine openly in the Church. Nor does this *Alexander* ever deny that Doctrine, in either of his long and vehement Letters on that Subject still extant, as we shall see presently.

(6.) The

(6.) The Antients do ever most studiously avoid all such Terms of Comparison, as *Coeval*, or *Coeternal* with the Father ; which yet do of all others most properly, and indeed only, express the *Athanasian* Doctrine in this Point. Nay, *Athanasius* himself, in his large Book of the *Incarnation of the Word*, written before the Council of Nice ; where he once uses the Term $\alpha\iota\omega\omicron\nu$, *Eternal* ; does yet ever avoid any word like $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota\omega\omicron\nu$, or *Coeternal* : how fond soever he was of any such Word about 30 or 40 Years afterward.

(7.) This matter is particularly clear in the Case of *Origen* : who, although he directly declared it for *Christian Doctrine*, that the Son was a *created Being*, and indeed the *antientest* of all *Creatures* ; yet had he a philosophical Notion, not only of the Possibility, but also of the Reality of the *Eternity* of the grand System of *Creatures*, the World itself, in some Sense or other ; and so was more at liberty, or indeed under a greater necessity than any other of the Antients, to believe still more strongly, and in an higher Sense, the *Eternity* of the Son ; by whose Ministration he ever asserted the World to have been made. Yet does this *Origen* himself plainly let us know, that there was no such *Christian Doctrine*, as the *Coeternity* of the Son with the Father, then known in the Church ; but that all such Notions of his bare *Eternity* were built, as was the other of the *Eternity* of the World, on metaphysick Subtilties only. For when he explains the words of the Psalmist, *This Day have I begotten thee*, and asserts for *Doctrine*, that there is no *Evening* with God ; he only ventures to suppose that there is no *Morning* neither ; but that a *Time*, coextended with God's unmade and eternal Life, is that *Day*, or *To-day*, wherein the Son was made. This unusual way of speaking, when he compares the antemundane *Eternity* to *Time*, he softens by the words, *If I may so say* ; and yet, after all, he dares only suppose thence, that the *beginning* of Christ's Origin, which he places somewhere within that *Eternity*, was not found, [was not discoverable ;] not that there was no such *beginning* at all, or that he was properly *coeternal* with his Father. This is still plainer in his Book *Peri Archon* ; where we find the like uncertain Philosophick Conjectures, whether the Son, as represented by *Light*, must not have been *always*, or *continually*, deriv'd from the Father ?

Let. p.16,
17.

Ap.Meth.
in Phot.
Cod.
ccxxxv.
Hieron.
ad Avit.
c. 3.
Peri Archon.
I. 2.

In Joan.
p.31.
Let. p.17.

I. 3.

as Rays are *always*, or *continually* derived from the Sun ?
 as also whether God was not *always* a Father ? But this
 only in the same manner, that the same *Origen* reasons
 in the same Book, with relation to the *World* itself also ; L 2.
 whether it was not *always* deriv'd from God ? lest God
 should not *always* have been a *Lord*, and a *Governor*, for
 want of the Existence of those Beings he was to govern ?
 Thus in the Case of the Holy Spirit, who, in *Origen's* Letter,
 Judgment, as we have seen, was also certainly a *Being* p. 35, 36.
made by the Ministration of the Son, and so must have
 received his Knowledge *after he was made* ; yet does he
 there declare it an absurd thing to say the Holy Spirit
 was *once*, or at *any time* ignorant notwithstanding.

(8.) Thus also, although, as we have seen, *Origen's*
 Opinion was, that the *World* itself was, in some Sense,
eternal, had *always* existed, and that *no time* could be
 assigned when it did not exist ; yet is the same *Origen*
 exprefs, that even the *Matter* of the *World* itself was
 not *unbegotten*, or *unmade*, but was *created out of nothing*
 by God ; and that it was not *coeternal* with God, but
later than he. This we learn both from his *Greek* Passa-
 ges, still extant, and from *Rufinus's* Version of his
 Book *Peri Archon*. In the former of which, he says
 expressly, that any other Providence, which might pro-
 vide that Matter which God made use of in the Creation
 of the *World*, must have been then owned, *πρεσβύτερα*
Θεῷ, *antienter than God* ; and that it is ever, *ἀπὸ πρῶτης*
τέχνης, *from a prior Art*, that the Matter for every Ope-
 ration is exhibited to the Artificer. And in the latter he
 directly affirms, that those Philosophers incurred the
 Imputation of Impiety, who said, that Matter was *Un-*
begotten, or *Unmade*, and *Coeternal* with the *Unbegotten*
God : He still taking the words *Unbegotten* and *Coeternal*
 for the same thing, or necessary Consequences from
 one another, as they evidently are in their own nature,
 and were ever in the first Ages esteem'd to be ; tho the
Athanasians have made a wide Difference between them.
 Accordingly *Huetius* gives us this true Account of *Origen's*
 Opinion upon this Head, viz. ' When he confutes the
 ' *Coeternity* of Matter, he means, that 'tis not *Unbegotten*,
 ' or *Unmade* : nor is it *Coeval with God* ; nor is it *another*
 ' *Principle* different from him : But he admits that
 ' Matter was so produc'd by God, *ante Secula*, before
 ' the *Ages* or *Eternities*, as Light proceeds from the
 ' Sun.

In Gen.
 i. 12.
 Vid. Phi-
 local. c.
 xxiv.

Peri Ar-
 chon.
 II. 1.

Origeni-
 an. p. 165.

Antient 'Sun.' Nor does even that spurious, at least greatly
 Monum. suspected Passage, cited out of our *Origen* by *Athana-*
 p. 89, 90. *sius*, concerning this Matter, in the least favour the
 proper *Coeternity*, as a Doctrine then known in the
 Church : but indeed implies the direct contrary ; when
 it affirms, that the gross *Arian* Assertions and Expres-
 sions themselves, that *there was a Time or Duration when*
the Son was not ; that *He was not before He began to be* :
 that *He was not always with God his Father* ; or the
 ascribing a direct *Beginning to his Existence*, were only
 too bold and dangerous a thing in his Opinion : while
 himself there owns it as an Instance of his own *Boldness*,
 that he asserted, on the contrary, that *no Time or Dura-*
tion could be assigned when He was not. Nor was it
 possible for *Origen* always to write so, if he had be-
 lieved, as the *Athanasians* pretend to do, that the *Coe-*
ternity itself is not only a direct, but even a *fundamen-*
tal Doctrine of Christianity. Nor in the double Copy we
 have of this *Origen's* original Catalogue of Fundamen-
 Peri Ar-
 chon. l. i.
 proæm.
 Pamph.
 Apol.
 tals, even as given us by *Rufinus* himself, is there one
 Syllable about the *Coeternity*, no more than there is a-
 bout the *Consubstantiality*, or *Coequality*, either of the
 Son or Holy Spirit with the Father. In short, the want
 of this Distinction between *always, eternal*, and the like
 words of *Time*, from strictly *Coæval*, or *Coeternal* with
 God himself, has been the grand Occasion of *Photius's*
 and others Mistakes ; as if *Origen*, by his bold Phrases
 concerning the *Eternity* of the World, meant, that it was
 really *coæval* or *coeternal* with its Creator : which yet he
 utterly denied, even as to that primary Matter itself, which
 was *prior* to the World, and out of which it was made.
 And the like Mistake, but a much more pernicious one,
 is that which has brought into the Church the *Athanasian*
 Doctrine of the strict *Coeternity* of the Son, and even at
 last of the Holy Spirit also with the *Father* ; who yet
 properly speaking, according to all the Antients, is the
Only Eternal God. Nor indeed does our *Origen* ever use
 higher Expressions concerning the unlimited *Eternity* of
 the Son, than he does of the like unlimited *Eternity* of
 the World ; nor ever pretends to derive that *Eternity*
 from any other Authority than metaphysick Subtilties,
 in any Place whatsoever : which Observations deserve
 the Reader's most attentive Reflection.

(9.) But lest the Reader should want some express Testimonies, that the words *ever*, and *always*; or the *Ages*, or *Eternities*, were such as of old belonged to *Time*, and the *Creatures*, and were not proper to describe the absolute and immutable *Eternity* of God, or *Coeternity* with God himself; take the same *Origen's* words, to this very purpose, concerning the Holy Ghost's being *always* a knowing Being, and *never* ignorant: *Hoc sane quod dicimus, vel semper erat; vel si quod aliud tale temporalis significationis nomen adducimus simpliciter, & cum venia accipiendum est. Quoniam Nominum quidem horum significationes Temporales sunt: Ea autem de quibus loquimur, tractu quidem Sermonis temporaliter nominantur; Natura autem sui omnem Intelligentiam Sensus temporalis excedunt: 'The Spirit was what we have said, either 'always; or if we make use of any other such word 'of a Temporal Signification, it must be taken as inaccurate, and on that account forgiven: Because the 'Signification of these words are Temporal; but the 'things we are speaking of, tho' discoursed of as we 'discourse of Things subject to Time, are yet in their 'own nature such, as are beyond all our Notions of 'Time whatsoever.' And elsewhere; *Si vero aliquid est Seculis majus; ita ut in Creaturis quidem Secula intelligantur, in aliis vero, quæ excedunt & supergrediuntur visibiles Creaturas, quod erit forte in Restitutione omnium, (cum ad perfectum finem universa pervenient) id fortasse plus aliquid esse quam Seculum intelligendum est; in quo erit omnium Consummatio — plus aliquid quam est Seculum & Secula, forte etiam plusquam est Secula Seculorum, &c.* 'If there be somewhat greater than 'Ages, or Eternities; so that those Ages, or Eternities, 'may indeed be understood as to Creatures; but as to 'other things, that exceed and transcend the visible 'Creatures, which perhaps will be at the Restitution of 'all things, when there shall be an entire Consummation of the Universe; --- it may be, somewhat more 'than is an Age or Eternity, than are Ages or Eternities; 'nay perhaps than Ages of Ages, or Eternities of Eternities themselves, &c.' So that all such words, in *Origen's* Opinion, were words of *Time*, and were vastly too low to express any thing like the immense and unalterable *Eternity* of, or indeed a strict *Coeternity* with the Supreme Being himself.*

Peri Archon. I. 5.

II. 3.

Antient
Monum.
p.208-224.

P. 211—
226.

Ib. p. 219.

(10.) It is farther very remarkable, that among the odious Imputations laid to the Charge of their Adversaries by the *Arians*, before the Council of Nice, we find the following *Athanasian* Expressions : *God ever was ; the Son ever was : The Father and the Son exist together ; the Son is co-existent with God ; he is ever-begotten ; begotten, not made : God did not precede the Son one Thought, or one Moment ; he is Eternal, and Co-eternal, and Unbegotten, and has his Existence together with the Father : and that all this while the Head of those Adversaries, Alexander, who must know of these odious Imputations laid on them, never owns the Truth of any one of them ; but either wholly denies them, or evades giving any direct Answer to them, as containing Notions quite beyond his Capacity : Of which his two large and vehement Letters, written against the *Arians* at that time, and still extant, do fully assure us. So that 'tis most evident, that *Alexander* never durst either think or say, the Son was *coeternal with the Father*, as his bolder Successors the *Athanasians*, some time afterward ventur'd to do.*

(11.) This Matter is clearer, particularly in the Case of this *Alexander*, because altho he used once the highest Expression of all concerning the Antiquity of the Son, viz. that he had, ἀπαρχὴν γενέσθαι, a beginningless Generation ; if I must so improperly render that antient Expression : yet does he ever take great care to avoid saying, that Christ was truly αἰεὶ or ἀναίδεο, eternal, or coeternal ; and insists upon the τὸ ἀγέννητον, the proper or absolute underived and unbegotten Eternity, as the peculiar Privilege of the Father ; and a just Consequence from his own Words, that the Father was greater than He ; as the same original Letters do fully shew. Thus he never once, even in the midst of his Zeal against the gross *Arians*, which was not small, accuses them for asserting, that the Son was not *Eternal*, or *Coeval*, or *Coeternal* with God ; or that God was before him : but says, that many of their Expressions imply'd, that He had a temporary Generation, or that some created Time had passed before He was begotten ; that there was a Time when God was both without his Word, and his Wisdom, even then when he must have made the World by his Word and his Wisdom : That there was a Time when God was not a Father, and had not a Son ; that when the *Arians* called the Son a Creature, and a

Work

Work, it must imply that He was one of those *common*
Creatures that were *made*, under the Father, by the Son ;
 that there was a *created* Point of Duration, or *Interval*,
 when the Son had no manner of Existence. And be-
 cause he easily foresaw, that the wiser part of the *A-*
rians, who believed an *Uncreated Eternal Duration*,
 prior to *Created Time* ; and determined, that the Son was
begotten and *created* in that *uncreated Eternity*, and was
 only derived from the *Father himself* : and tho he was
 really *created*, or was in that Sense a *Creature*, it was on-
 ly in a Rank vastly superior to those *Creatures* that were
made by the Son, would thence charge him with the Opi-
 nion, that the Son was then strictly *Coeval*, *Coeternal*,
 and indeed equally *Unbegotten* with the Father : He ve-
 ry fully and largely guards against such terrible *Imputa-*
tions, and artfully excuses himself from speaking more
 distinctly upon those Points, as quite beyond his Reach
 or Ability ; and such as, in his Judgment, was very
dangerous, if not *unchristian*, to enquire farther into.
 He directly affirms, ' That the *Arian* Language im- P. 215.
 ply'd, that there was an *Interval* of created Time be-
 fore the Existence of that very *Wisdom of the Father*,
 which created the *Universe* ; in which *Interval*
 therefore the Son was not yet made by the Father ;
 and that by consequence they gave the Ly to that
 Text of Scripture, which said, that it was not any
 Interval of Time, or of the *Ages*, but the Son him-
 self, that was the *Firstborn of the whole Creation*, or the Col. i. 15.
 very first Being that God created. So that it seems
 this *Alexander* did not then deny that the Son was made
 by the Father ; but only insisted, that he was made by
 the Father before all created Time, and was the First
 of all those things that were thus made by him ;
 and that therefore no Times, no Ages, no Eternities,
 no Beginning of, or Interval between any such Times,
 Ages, or Eternities ; (all which he ever directly esteems
 to have been part of that Creation which was made by
 the Ministration of the Son) could possibly be before
 him. He also expressly files the Father and Son two
 Natures, and calls those *unskilful Persons*, ' who did P. 217,
 not own the vast Difference there was between the Un- 21.
 begotten Father, and those Beings that were created by
 Him out of Nothing : and so left no room for the mid-
 dle only-begotten Nature between them, which was that
 of

P. 21, 22. ' of the Son ; by whose Ministration the Universe was
 ' created out of nothing.' Which plain Passages of this
Alexander's own Letters, especially if they be taken to-
 gether with, and further explained by the express and
 publick Testimonies of his own Presbyters and Deacons
 to his face, in their eminent and remarkable Epistle to
 him at that time, extant intirely in my Letter, will
 prove, that the *Eusebian* Doctrine, and no other, was
 ' what they had received, not only from their *Forefa-*
 ' *thers* in general, but from *Alexander himself* also in
 ' particular : that he had still publicly taught them,
 ' that the Son was not a *consubstantiated Part* of the Fa-
 ' ther ; that He was *created* by the *Will* of God ; that
 ' He was not *Eternal*, nor *Coeternal*, nor *Unbegotten*, as
 ' the Father was ; nor had his Existence *together with*
 ' the Father : but that He had himself preached this
 ' *express Doctrine* in the Church, in their Hearing, that
 ' God was *before* all things, and especially was *before*
 ' *his Son.*' None of which Doctrines of *Alexander* are
 once denied, nay indeed are greatly confirmed, as his
 old genuine Opinions, by these his own Epistles : All
 this, I say, put together, seems to me little less than
 a *Demonstration*, that even this *Alexander* himself, and
 that part of the Church in his time, which, with him,
 vehemently opposed the gross *Arians*, understood the
 antient Expressions, now before us, in the Sense I have
 above explained them, and in no other ; and indeed
 that both this *Alexander*, and the same part of the
 Church with him, were then, in the main, of the *Eu-*
sebian Opinion ; and did not then believe, in any pro-
 per Sense, either the *Consubstantiality*, *Coequality*, or *Co-*
eternity of the Son of God.

(12.) *Philo* the Jew, who was contemporary with the
 Apostles, shews, that αἰδιον, or *Eternal*, when used of
 the Word of God, did not, in those early Ages, mean
 the same with *Coeval*, or *Coeternal*. For while, in one
 place, he calls the Son expressly, Λόγος ὁ αἰδιον Θεὸς τῆς
 αἰωνίου, the *Eternal Word of the Everlasting God* ; which
 looks more like to the *Coeternity*, than almost any other
 Expression in all Antiquity : yet does he directly assure
 us elsewhere, that the Father was *before him* ; and this
 probably not only in *Dignity*, as to which the words are
 very express, but in *Antiquity* also, in this remarkable
 Passage : ' Wherefore is it said, that God made Man
 ' in

Ap. Eu-
 feb. Præp.
 Evang. vi.
 13.
 Ibid.

' in the *Image of God*, and not in *his own Image*, as if he
 ' spake of *another God*? Why, this Oracle was delivered
 ' very rightly, and wisely: For no mortal Being is ca-
 ' pable of a Formation, according to the Image of the
 ' Supreme Being, and Father of the Universe; but on-
 ' ly of the *Second God*, who is *his Word*. For it was ne-
 ' cessary that the rational Character, which is in the
 ' Soul of Man, should be imprinted by the *Divine*
 ' *Word*. For this God, who is $\pi\epsilon\theta\ \tau\tilde{\epsilon}\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\tilde{\epsilon}$, *before the*
 ' *Word*, is superior to every rational Nature; but it
 ' was no way fit that any begotten Being should be
 ' made like to him, who is placed, $\psi\alpha\tilde{\rho}\ \tau\tilde{\epsilon}\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\tilde{\epsilon}$, *above*
 ' *the Word*, in a certain most exalted, and entirely pe-
 ' culiar Dignity of his Idea.' And again, says he else-
 where, ' To be able to meet with the *Place*, or the *De Somn.*
 ' *Word*; [which are here two Names for the same Per- *p. 574, 575,*
 ' son;] is a most satisfactory Benefit, to such as are *583.*
 ' not able to see, $\tau\tilde{\epsilon}\ \pi\epsilon\theta\ \tau\omicron\tau\tilde{\epsilon}\ \kappa\iota\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\tilde{\epsilon}\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\nu$, *That God who*
 ' *is before both Place and Word.*' Nor do the same
 Philo's plain Expressions, already produced, that God *Let. p. 9,*
 created him the first of his *Works*; that he was a *created 10.*
Being; that he was the most antient of all things that
 were *made*; that he was God's *most antient Angel*, and
 the like; at all agree with the Doctrine of the *Coeterni-*
ty. And now I should think, My Lord, that this Point
 were sufficiently determined; and that a Person *created*
 or *made* by God, and *before* whom God did certainly
 exist, could not be supposed *coeval* or *coeternal* with that
 God who *created* or *made* him. Yet is there still an *A-*
thanasian Distinction to be replied to; and it will be
 said, perhaps, that altho the Father were the *Creator* or
Maker, and the Son *created* or *made* by him; altho the
 Father were the *Cause* of the Existence of the Son, and
 the Son were *Caused* by him; and altho the Father was
 indeed *before* him, in the *Order of Causality*, yet might
 the Son be *coeval* and *coeternal* with the Father, in the
Order of Duration notwithstanding. Thus the latter *Pla-* *Orige-*
tonists, as the Great *Huetius* observes, that they might *nian. p.*
 reconcile *Aristotle's* Notion, of the *Eternity* of the World, *166.*
 with *Plato's* Doctrine, that it was *made* by God, pre-
 tended that *Plato's* meaning was only this, that the
 World was *made from all Eternity*. And thus will it be
 with the true *Athanasians*, when they shall find that
 they cannot deny, that the Son was *created* or *made* by
 the

P. 30. prius

Orat. ad
San. Cæt.
c. 11.

Let. p. 34.

Orat. I.
contr. A-
rian. p.
433, 434.

the Father, and that the Father was *before* him ; that the Father was the *Cause*, and the Son the *Caused*; and all this by the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, in the former intire three Centuries and an half: They will then be forced desperately to affirm, as I have already foretold, that, all this notwithstanding, the Son may still have been *created*, or *made*, *ab æterno* ; may have been *coeval* with his Father who *created*, or *made*, him ; may have been *Caused* as early as his *Cause* existed, and so may have been *Co-eternal* with him. Nor is there any end of the Pleas, and Excuses, and Evasions, and Distinctions of Parties, when once they have run into any gross Errors of this Nature, before they will confess and amend them. All I shall therefore say here, is but this ; that I have *never once* met with this *Plea*, in this *Case*, during three entire Centuries and an half ; and am therefore satisfied, that it has nothing to do with the Primitive Doctrines of Christianity : but that I have *more than once* there met with the *Case itself* directly put, both as to the *Son* and the *Holy Spirit*, as *caused* or *created* ; but so as to overthrow all such *Athanasian* Evasions whatsoever. Thus *Constantine* the Emperor, who proposed the *Consubstantiality*, and who *banished* the *Arians*, at the Council of *Nice*, does himself declare, that God was the *αἰτία*, the *Cause* of the *Son* ; and that the *Son* was the *αἰτιασθὲν*, what was *Caused* by him ; and this as an Instance of what he was there expressly asserting, that since the *Son* was the *Cause* of the *World*, and the *World* what was *Caused* by him, he must therefore of necessity, *πρὸ ὧν παρῆεν τῶν ὄντων*, exist before the *World*. Thus also *Origen* expressly reasons, that if, as he believed, the *Holy Spirit* were *made* by the *Word* or *Son* of *God*, that *Word* or *Son* must have been *antienter* than he. Thus also *Athanasius* himself, as to *Creatures*, is express, that altho *God* could *always* make *Creatures*, yet those *made* *Creatures* could not be *eternal*, nor *coexistent* with *God*, who was *eternal* ; which primitive, just, and cogent Reasonings are sufficient utterly to silence this *Athanasian* Evasion for ever.

(13.) But what determines this whole Matter to the greatest Satisfaction, is this ; That when, after all that had past at *Alexandria*, and elsewhere, the Council of *Nice* itself came, with sufficient Vehemence, to the Condemnation of the *Arians*, it never did, never durst condemn

condemn them for denying either the strict *Eternity* or *Coeternity*; or for saying the Son was *Created*. That Council never did, never durst themselves declare, that He was either *Uncreated*, *Eternal*, or *Coeternal*. Nor indeed does it appear, by all their Acts, that any One Bishop there present, unless we except *Marcellus* and *Eustathius*, the *Sabellians*; did ever then believe such a proper *Eternity* or *Coeternity*. And indeed *Athanasius* seems to have been the very first pretended Catholick Christian, that ever ventured to say, that the Son did, *συνπαρεχεν τῷ πατρὶ*, coexist with the Father; [was *συναιδιος*, coeternal] *συνάναρχος*, co-beginningless, and *ἀγέννητος*, or *ἀγέννητος*, unbegotten, or unmade. When Your Lordship has used Yourself to the original Remains of Primitive Antiquity, and particularly to those that concern the Council of *Nice*, You will easily understand the great Strength of my Evidence under this Head, but hardly before.

Op. p. 233,
238, 287.

(14.) It is also highly worth Observation, that neither *Alexander*, nor the Presbyters and Deacons of *Alexandria*, nor *Eusebius*, who apply *ἀναρχος*, beginningless, or, *αἰώνιος*, everlasting, or *αἰδιος*, eternal (if I must so improperly render those words) to the Son's Generation, do, in such Cases, apply those Characters to the Son himself. They allow indeed, that his Generation was *ἀναρχος*, and *αἰδιος*, that he was begotten, *πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνων*, before everlasting Times: i. e. with the Additions of such words, *Generation* and *Times*, as were then no way expressive of, but indeed did fully deny the *Coeternity*; as we shall see presently. But they did not say, that the Son himself was *ἀναρχος*, beginningless; or *αἰδιος*, eternal; or *ἀγέννητος*, unmade; but the direct contrary. Thus *Alexander* ever greatly dreaded the mention of any such word as *coeternal*. The Presbyters and Deacons of *Alexandria* expressly denied, that the Son was either *eternal* or *coeternal*; and *Eusebius* wrote vehemently against the Heretick *Marcellus*, for affirming, that the Son was *αἰδιος*, and *ἀναρχος*, and *ἀγέννητος*, eternal, and beginningless, and unmade. So that those ancient Christian Writers, whose Expressions seem to carry the *Generation* of the Son the highest of all others, did the most evidently dread to affirm, he was *coeternal* with God; or indeed the most expressly denied such *Coeternity*, as a Doctrine grossly Heretical and intolerable among Christians.

(15.) I conclude with what I esteem a direct *Demonstration*, that neither the *Ante-nicene* Fathers, nor the Council of *Nice* itself, could possibly believe the *Co-eternity* of the Son; because they ever unanimously professed, that the Son was γεννητός, or γεννῆτος, *begotten*, or *made* by the Father; and that no other Being or Person was ἀγεννητός, or ἀγεννῆτος, *unbegotten*, or *unmade*, but the Father alone. For that γεννητός and γεννῆτος, *begotten* and *made*, as also ἀγεννητός, and ἀγεννῆτος, *unbegotten*, and *unmade*, of old signified the very same thing, and were promiscuously used and translated, even till the very middle of the fourth Century, if not later, is most evident in the antient Manuscripts and Writers: and, as to the later word, is directly confessed and proved by the

Op. p. 207. *Benedictines* themselves, in their Preface to *Athanasius's* Treatise *Of the Decrees of the Synod of Nice*; and is indeed, which they ought there also to have observed, ever allowed and taken for granted by *Athanasius* himself, in his three distinct Discourses upon this Subject.

P. 233
— 237. p. Now that the word γεννητός, or γεννῆτος, *begotten*, or *made*,
434—438 was ever then understood expressly to deny the *Coeternity*
p. 760, 761. of that Being or Person, who was *begotten* or *made*, with God who was his *Father* or *Creator*, even till the middle of that fourth Century, if not later, is most evident through all Christian Antiquity; nor was it then, that I know of, ever denied or called in question by any Christians: who all suppos'd that *eternal Generation*, which is the present *Athanasian Doctrine*, was absolutely *heretical*, *absurd*, and *impossible*. As also That the opposite words, ἀγεννητός, or ἀγεννῆτος, *unbegotten*, or *unmade*, and almost only those words, were then ever understood expressly to include an *absolute Eternity*; or in a manner, to declare the very same Notion with the word συναιδός, or *coeternal*: (which, till the fourth Century, was rarely used by any Christian, in any Case whatsoever) is alike evident through all Christian Antiquity. Nor was it then, that I know of, ever denied or called in question by any Christians: who all supposed, that no other Being or Person was *Unbegotten*, or *Unmade*, or strictly *Eternal*, but only the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. The full Evidence for which Assertions, and for all the other Assertions in these Papers, shall be largely produc'd, whenever I shall be so hap-

py as to obtain such fair *Referees* and *Arbitrators*, as may be proper Judges of that Evidence. However, that Your Lordship may not be quite at a Loss about such Evidence, You may please to observe two or three things, which plainly suppose the Truth of those Observations. The first is this, that *Irenæus*, who of all the very antient Fathers has the most direct Expressions, that the Word, or Son, was *eternal*, did *always coexist* with God his Father, that the Son and Spirit were *ever* with him, and the like ; does yet never pretend he was *unbegotten* or *unmade*, or *coeternal* with God, but the contrary. For while he never uses the word ἀίδιον or αἰώνιον, at all, but frequently uses the word ἀγέννητος, *unbegotten*, (which the old *Latin* Version generally renders, *infectus, unmade*,) for that *Coeternity* ; and still as appropriated to the Father alone : In the chief Place of all, where 'tis supposed, from the *Latin* Version, that he says Christ was *not made* ; if we paraphrase the Place as *Irenæus* must have written and meant it, 'tis a direct Denial of that *Coeternity*. 'Thou art not, says he, O Man ! *unbe-*
' *gotten*, or *coeternal* with God ; neither didst thou *co-*
' *exist* with God, as did He that was begotten earlier
' than the beginning of the World, and has ever since
' been with him, which is the great Antiquity of his
' own, or his nearest Word ; while thou art but of
' yesterday, and but *just now* receivedst the Beginning of
' thy Creation from him.'

II. 43.
169.

The second Fact is this, That there was no Expedient found, at or after the Council of *Nice*, whereby to oppose the gross *Arian* Consequences from this universally acknowledg'd Appropriation of the ἀγέννητος, or strict *Eternity*, to the Person of the Father alone, but by expressly joining with the *Arians* so far, and giving up all Pretences to any such *Eternity*, or strictly *eternal* Generation ; and by advancing the metaphysick, virtual, or potential Existence of the Son in the Father before his Generation, a Notion never heard of till the days of *Montanus*, in its stead ; with the Condemnation of the *Arians* for denying that *strange sort of Eternity* ; as all the original Records most evidently shew.

The third Fact is this, That *Athanasius* himself was so distressed by the like *Arian* Consequences, that he chose to say, that the Character ἀγέννητος, or ἀγένιος, *unbegotten*, or *unmade*, or strictly *eternal*, was unscriptu-

Ubi supra.

P. 761.
P. 99.

ral ; and that though some of the Antients had appropriated it to the Father, and he hoped they did not mean any harm thereby, yet as for himself, he did not like that Appropriation thereof to the Father ; but thought that the Son might be said to be *Unbegotten*, and *Unmade*, and so *Coeternal* with the Father. For which he has the Assurance to cite the spurious Epistles of *Ignatius* ; and this in absolute contradiction to himself before, to the genuine Epistles, and to every other Christian Record, from the very days of our Blessed Saviour, to that very day. Since therefore, My Lord, every Catholick Christian, till that time, openly confessed, that no Being or Person was *unbegotten*, or *unmade*, but the Father ; and that the Son was himself a Being or Person *begotten* or *made* by the Father ; and withal, that during that time, it was all along unanimously confessed, that every Being or Person that was thus *begotten*, or *made*, could not possibly be *coeval* or *coeternal* with that God who *begat* or *made* him : as also that the Character of *unbegotten*, or *unmade*, then entirely appropriated to the Father, was alike openly and unanimously confessed to express the peculiar *Eternity* of the Father alone, even in opposition to that of the Son himself ; it follows, to the degree of *Demonstration*, that the Son was then universally allowed not to be properly *eternal*, or *coeternal* with the Father. In short, the *Athanasian Hypothesis* entirely depends on the Solidity of this Distinction, between a *Begotten* and *Made*, between an *Unbegotten* and *Unmade* Being or Person : for which yet there is no manner of Foundation, that I know of, in three compleat Centuries and an half of Christianity.

P. 136.

Upon the whole, Your Lordship had, I think, small reason to say, ‘ That it is astonishing I should, with so great Confidence, peremptorily assert, That no one Person excepted against the word *Created*, till *Athanasius* ; nor any one asserted, that the Son was *Uncreated*, till he did it : ’ since I still find the Assertions to be strictly and literally true ; and neither Your Lordship, nor Bishop Bull, in his *incomparable* Book ; nor Dr. *Waterland*, in his *admirable* Tract, as You call them ; nor any other *Athanasian* either has, or can disprove the same, by any of the Records of Christian Antiquity now extant. One or two perhaps may be named, who, upon some Nicety as to Scripture-Language, or some Subtilties

Subtilties
you, ma
neither
mean
the Sa
Father
Your I
say, t
to affe
‘ his e
‘ per a
‘ know
‘ Chu
‘ ter d
this A
neithe
nor an
same,
extant
Direc
But
prefer
and ad
to do,
I mea
tions,
monies
same ;
monie
Thus
on the
Church
and b
the S
the d
monst
Corru
terpro
Inwar
and B
receiv
the C
Trans
more

Subtilties in Philosophy, did not like the word *γινόμε-
νον*, *made* ; but as to the word *κτισθεῖσα* *created*, they
neither did, nor indeed, could possibly reject it : I
mean this, because they so unanimously agreed, that
the Sacred Scripture itself directly affirmed, that the
Father *created* the Son, before the World began. And
Your Lordship has, I think, still much less reason to
say, that 'tis no less *astonishing*, that I should venture
to assert, ' That for the *Coeternity* of the Spirit, or even
' his equal Antiquity with the Son, there is not one pro-
' per and direct Testimony, Sacred or Primitive, that I
' know of, now extant in the Records of the Christian
' Church, till long after the Council of *Nice*, in the lat-
' ter days of *Athanasius* himself : ' Since I still find that
this Assertion also is strictly and literally true ; and that
neither Your Lordship, nor Bp *Bull*, nor Dr. *Waterland*,
nor any other *Athanasian*, either has, or can disprove the
same, by any of the Records of Christian Antiquity now
extant. *Remote Consequences*, My Lord, are one thing ;
Direct Testimonies another.

But here, indeed, I must confess, My Lord, that the
present *Athanasian* Churches are *wise in their Generation* ;
and act as is most convenient for their Cause ; which is
to do, in this Case, as the Church of *Rome* does in others ;
I mean to insist on some few plausible modern *Transla-
tions*, and *Interpretations* of Scripture, or *antient Testi-
monies*, with the usual *Athanasian Inferences* from the
same ; and then *compel* all the contrary Texts, Testi-
monies, and Evidence whatsoever to comply therewith.
Thus have I myself heard a *Romanist* lay his stress up-
on those words of our Saviour, concerning the Christian
Church, *The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it* ; Mat. x.
and by the frequent Repetition of that single Text, in 18.
the Sense he had been all along used to, supersede all
the direct Facts and Records of Antiquity, which de-
monstrate the Greatness and Number of the Popish
Corruptions. And thus can they prove, from their In-
terpretation of our own Catechism, which says, *The
Inward and Spiritual Grace*, in the Eucharist, *is the Body
and Blood of Christ*, which are verily and indeed taken and
received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper ; that we, of
the Church of *England*, do also believe the Doctrine of
Transubstantiation, as well as they ; in spite of all the
more numerous and more certain Demonstrations to the
contrary.

contrary. In such Cases, My Lord, the Authority and Interest of the present Church ; with a strong Desire that she may not be found to have been so much, and so long, and so grossly mistaken ; and that in Points of such great moment ; joined to some small apparent Evidence, easily renders that *small Evidence* very considerable, and bears down all other Arguments and Demonstrations whatsoever.

P. 15, 16.

As to what Your Lordship says, without, and against, all Authority in the World that I know of, about the *Jews* and *Mahometans* being hardened by the *Eusebian* ; or, as You call it, the *Arian Doctrine* : I shall remind Your Lordship, on the other side, of the grand Difficulty the Missionaries always find as to the Conversion of the *Jews* and Heathens to Christianity, from the *Atbanasian Doctrine* ; which they take to be no other than direct *Polytheism*, and of the same nature with *Pagan Idolatry*. Take this in the words of a very good Friend of mine, Mr. *Emlyn*, who had plainly discovered and judiciously vindicated part of the old Christian Doctrine before I did so ; and who has suffered much more in *Ireland* than I have done in *England*, for the same :

Humble
Inquiry
in calce.

‘Tis yet, says Mr. *Emlyn*, a further Grief to think, what a fatal Stop is hereby put to the Progress of the Gospel ; whose Rejection by *Jews*, *Mahometans*, and *Pagans*, is undeniably occasioned by the common *Doctrine* of the *Incarnation* of God. One may read in *Le Compté’s History* of *China*, how the Heathens derided the Christians *Doctrine* of a mortal God ; and upon that account looked upon Christianity as *fabulous* as their own Religion.’ And Dr. *Casaubon*, in his Book of *Credulity and Incredulity*, says, ‘ He could prove, by many Instances out of History, that this *Doctrine* has kept more People from embracing the *Christian Faith*, than any other thing he knew of.’ Nor will

P. 118.

Sarac.
Conq.

p. 43, 90,
134, 227,
307.

Conf. xi.
xxxiv.

Xeres, p.
53.

any one who reads such Books as Mr. *Ockley’s Saracen Conquests* ; the *Conferences* of the Missionaries with the *Malabarians* ; or Mr. *Xeres’s Address* to the *Jews*, at all doubt of the Truth of this Observation. Upon which Occasion I beg leave to present Your Lordship and the World with a very honest, judicious, and Christian Letter, which was sent me from one that was then, and is still to me, wholly unknown, some Years ago ; and was partly occasion’d by that great Scandal which the *Atbanasian*

Atbanasian

athanasian Doctrine gave the Unbelievers, when he was among them. And I take the Freedom to say, that it very well deserves Your Lordship's, and every sober *Athanasian's* serious Consideration. It was in these words:

Reverend Sir,

I Have read some of your Writings with singular Pleasure, and I hope also with some Profit. I do confess to you I am a Clergyman (tho unworthy of the Dignity;) but having not had Conveniencies (like Men in the Universities, or where easy Access may be had to large Libraries) to search into Primitive Learning, no wonder if I have taken things upon Trust, and depended on the Judgments and Readings of Men more Learned than myself. I was trained up in the Belief of the Trinity, as it's receiv'd in the Church of *England*: tho I confess the *Athanasian* Creed (as it's commonly called) has often been a Scandal to the feet of my Judgment; but in my Youth I slept over it; resolving all into Mystery. And having some Systems and Explications of the Trinity, I naturally led myself into this way of Reasoning, *That the Nature of God is unsearchable*, and therefore if God had revealed in his Word, that there were three distinct Persons, who were coeternal and coequal, in the Divine Essence, I ought to believe it, tho I could not comprehend it. And being taught, that God had revealed it in such and such Texts of Scripture, I took it for granted: tho I confess in my Prayers (I mean when I prayed by myself) I think I did never address myself but only to the Father; because our Saviour had taught us to ask of the Father, *in his Name*, with the Promise, that if we did so, we should obtain. Having been a Chaplain abroad in a Ship, I was sorry that the *Turks, Jews, &c.* were so very much offended with the Christian Religion, upon these two Accounts, *viz.* the one the worshipping of Images, the other the Belief and Worship of the Trinity; which seemed to them to be the Belief of three Gods. As to the first, I thought we of the Church of *England* were happy, in having purg'd away that foul Error of Popery; and so I could vindicate the Religion of us Christians, with a much greater Strength than a Priest of the Church of *Rome*. But as to the Trinity, I confess

' fess I have sometimes wished, that God had not so far
 ' reveal'd that Myſtery to us, unleſs he had been pleas'd
 ' to have diſcovered it farther ; in regard 'twas a Stum-
 ' bling-Block to Heathens, &c. But, however, I con-
 ' tented myſelf with this Conſideration, that we ought
 ' to ſubmit our Judgments and Wills to the Good-
 ' Pleaſure and Wiſdom of God. When Dr. *Sherlock*
 ' publiſhed his *Explication of the Trinity*, by thoſe odd
 ' Terms of *Self and Mutual Conſciouſneſs*, I was much
 ' offended: but was not pleas'd with *South's* An-
 ' ſwer ; in regard he did not reply in the Spirit of Meek-
 ' neſs ; but with that Anger and Arrogancy, which fa-
 ' vours more of the Temper of *Lucifer*, than of the
 ' moſt bleſſed and humble Jeſus Chriſt. Tho I had
 ' read ſome of the *Socinians*, yet their Writings ſpeak-
 ' ing ſo (as I think) falſely and unworthily of our Bleſ-
 ' ſed Redeemer, I took a Prejudice againſt them ; and
 ' began to ſettle myſelf in this Reſolution, that I would
 ' ſearch, nor read no more. That there was *one in*
 ' *three, and three in one*, of equal Majeſty, Power,
 ' and Glory.' And therefore notwithstanding what
 ' Biſhop *Stillingfleet* ſaid (by way of Contempt) I re-
 ' ſolv'd to receive the Trinity of the Mob, or the Faith
 ' of the Mob in reſpect of the Trinity : And this I have
 ' frequently ſaid between Jeſt and Earneſt, but meant it
 ' in good Earneſt among my Friends, that I was of the
 ' Mob in reſpect of this Doctrine.

' I therefore refus'd to read Dr. *Clarke's* moſt admira-
 ' ble Book for ſome time, or any thing wrote by you ;
 ' I was at a Point I thought with myſelf, and would
 ' torment myſelf no more. I had often in my
 ' Mouth, 'tis *magnum Myſterium Chriſtianismi, Doctrina*
 ' *magis adoranda quam ſcrutanda*, with others of the like
 ' Import. And when I did read ſuch Paſſages as *The*
 ' *Father is greater than I* ; and of Chriſt, that he is
 ' *the Firſt-born of every Creature* ; and as often as I have
 ' buried the Dead, and have read the Leſſon appointed
 ' for that Office, and have from ſuch manifeſt Proofs
 ' been induc'd to think, that ſurely our Bleſſed Sa-
 ' viour, and the Holy Ghoſt, could not have equal
 ' Majeſty, Power, Eternity, Glory, and Dominion,
 ' with the Father : I have then begg'd of God (if I
 ' did think amiſs) to pardon me ; ſince 'twas a Myſtery
 ' I could not underſtand : and this Conſideration, that
 ' God

1 Cor. xv.
 24—28.

God does not require of us more than he gives us, administered Comfort, that if I did sometimes think amiss God would pardon it; since 'twas a Sin (if it was one) that was involuntary.

I should tire myself to write, and you to read all the Struggles I have had in my Mind about this Matter. But since I have seen Dr. *Clarke*, whom I exceedingly reverence; and some things of yours, I begin to be at peace; I hope on a better foot than what I rested on before.

Sir, I have so far discovered my Nakedness, that I am ashamed to write my Name. God grant we may know one another hereafter. I beg a Share in your Prayers. I am so far a Stranger to you, that I believe I never saw you but once; which was accidentally, as you pass along the Street: Dr. *Clarke* I never saw, &c.

Feb. 6. 1715-6.

And thus far, My Lord, I have presumed to argue with Your Lordship, as with a *Scholar*, and a *Christian*; in both which Capacities I wish Your Lordship had very many Superiors, or indeed Equals: I do not mean only among those of Your Lordship's Quality; who are generally too deeply engaged in less important Studies, if not in more criminal Pursuits and Pleasures, to attend, in any serious manner, to such religious Enquiries as these before us; but even among those whose Stations, and Opportunities, and Functions render it much more inexcusable for them not to be eminent in such Sacred Learning. Nor would I be any ways instrumental in discouraging Your Lordship, or any others, from examining, and comparing, and determining for yourselves; even tho' it be only in that way of modern Dispute and Controversy, of which I have otherwise so very low an Opinion: I mean this, in comparison with the gross Stupidity of the Bulk of Mankind; who still blindly and zealously follow their several Leaders, without so much as distinctly knowing what those Leaders have to say for themselves, as to the several Controversies between them and their Adversaries. However, I hope, the great Pains Your Lordship has taken in this more imperfect way of modern Controversies and Commentaries, may be the happy Occasion of your Application to that more perfect way of perusing all the Originals themselves; at least so far as the *Apostolical Fathers*,

L and

and the *two first Centuries* of the Church ; to whose original Language Your Lordship has already sufficiently shewed Yourself to be no Stranger : where the Authors are not very many, nor very large, and so will not require a very long time for their Perusal. And I Assure Your Lordship, that as I should be sorry to see any *Rejoinder* to this from Your Lordship, before You had read so far, at least, in Christian Antiquity Yourself ; so after that I should be very well pleased to know the Result of such Your Lordship's own original Enquiries : which would indeed, I venture to say it, afford You a very different View of truly *Primitive Christianity*, from that which is taken from the Extracts and Abridgments of the antient Writers, made by any modern Party whatsoever.

P. 157.

But now if, after all, Your Lordship should expect that I make some *distinct Reply* to what You say in *another Capacity*, as a Peer of *Great Britain* ; especially with regard to the *Convocation*, in Your *Postscript* : I must declare, that I am in no Station that capacitates me to be a competent Judge of the Legal Powers, Privileges, and Duties of the Ministry, of the Legislature, or of the Convocation ; or indeed what it is politically fit for them to do, or not to do, in any such Cases. Accordingly I shall wave any large Debates here concerning them. Only I must observe, that Your Lordship's Citation of *Mecænas's* Advice to *Augustus*, ' Never to suffer ' any Innovation in Religion ' with Approbation, is very surprizing : since Your Lordship well knows, that it was in this very *Augustus's* days, that our Blessed Saviour was born ; and in his immediate *Successor's* days that he suffered ; and himself introduced the greatest *Innovation in Religion* that ever was. And *what Disturbances, what Miseries, what fatal Feuds and Animosities* that grand *Innovation in Religion* caused, not only in *one Nation*, but over no small part of the World, before it could obtain there, the *Histories* of many *Ages* sufficiently inform us. And yet I hope Your Lordship does not approve of either the Advice of *Mecænas*, or Practice of the *Roman Emperors*, as to their consequent Opposition to that grand *Innovation in Religion*, notwithstanding. That 'tis very reasonable the Convocation and Clergy should take care of that *Flock of Christ*, of which the *Holy Ghost* has made them *Overseers*, as Your Lordship speaks, it cannot be denied. But how their not Sitting and Voting in

Convo-

Convocation at present, takes away the Opportunity of their taking the personal *Care of their Flocks*, or of their *refuting and reclaiming* Men from their Errors, as Your Lordship supposes, I can no way understand. I should rather think, that they are now more at liberty for *taking personal Care of their Flocks*, and for *refuting and reclaiming* Men from their Errors, than when they are busy about their Privileges and their Votes in Convocation : or rather I should think, that the present Interval of their Meetings there, might afford its most Learned Members a proper time for such a *previous Examination* of all Points, now under debate, as I have recommended in these Papers ; and such indeed as might prepare Materials for their more authentick Examination and Determination, when they meet again in that publick Capacity. And I humbly hope, that it is no way below any of our Governors, Ecclesiastical or Civil, in any of their Capacities, carefully to *enquire after what is true*, and exactly to *do what is lawful and right* : that it is no way beneath them, in any of their Capacities, to see distinctly, that what they *punish*, be real *Wickedness and Vice* ; and what they *maintain* be really *God's true Religion and Vertue* : Which things, when they are once sufficiently taken care of, I shall have small reason to be concern'd what Punishments soever they shall think fit to inflict upon such horrid Crimes, as impious *Idolatry* and profane *Blasphemy*. The fear of coming too near the one, if not both of which heinous Offences against God himself, being a principal Reason why I dare not join in some parts of the *Athanasian Creed*, nor dare offer up some parts of the *Athanasian Prayers and Doxologies* ; and of both which Crimes, I hope, I shall ever have equal Abhorrence with Your Lordship, or any other good Christian whomsoever. And ' May Almighty God, the ' Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, be pleased so to direct ' and prosper all publick Consultations, whether Sacred ' or Civil, as may best tend to the Advancement of his ' Glory, the Good of his Church, the Safety, Honour, ' and Welfare of our Sovereign, and his Kingdoms ; ' that all things may be so ordered and settled, by their ' Endeavours, upon the best and surest Foundations ; ' that Peace and Happiness, Truth and Justice, Religion ' and Piety, may be established among us for all Generations : and this for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. ' To

‘ To whom, with the Father, in the Holy Ghost, be
‘ Honour and Glory, for ever. *Amen.*’

P. 3.

Address
to the
Princes
of Europe.

N. B. Since Your Lordship, it seems, never saw that *Clause*, which I still confess, as I did before, that I had a great hand in preparing and offering, and which was in part the Occasion of my Letter to Your Lordship, for the *Toleration of the Christian Religion itself*, for so I esteem it to be ; I here set it down intirely for Your Lordship's and the World's Perusal ; hoping that our Legislators may, one time or other, among their several Schemes for *Indulgence and Toleration*, bethink themselves, that it may not be very absurd to grant the same even to the *Christian Religion itself* : while I am fully satisfied, and have long since *demonstrated* it to the World, that *this Christian Religion itself* has hitherto been almost wholly excluded the Benefit of such *publick Indulgence*, or *Toleration* thro' *Christendom*, even ever since the fourth or fifth Centuries of the Church. The *Clause* was in these words :

‘ **W** Hereas in an Act of Parliament, *primo Gul. & Mar.* for exempting Protestant Dissenters, &c. from divers Penalties, &c. there are several Restrictions and Limitations, by which many of his Majesty's peaceable Protestant Subjects are still left incapable of receiving the Benefit of such Exemption, &c. therefore, for the quieting the Minds of all such his Majesty's good Protestant Subjects, be it enacted, &c. That every Protestant Dissenter from the Church of *England* by Law established, who shall make and subscribe the Declaration against Popery, and take the Oaths in the said Act mentioned ; and who shall, instead of any other Declarations and Subscriptions therein required, declare and subscribe his unfeigned Assent to, and his Belief of, the Holy *Christian Religion*, as contained in the Scriptures of the *Old and New Testament*, and in the *Creed*, commonly called the *Apostles Creed*, shall have the full Benefit of the said Exemptions, as if he had made all the Declarations and Subscriptions therein hitherto required : any thing in the aforesaid Act, or in any other Act, to the contrary, in any wise notwithstanding.’

I am, My LORD, with great Respect;

Your Lordship's most Humble,

London, May 2. 1721.

and Obedient Servant,

WILL. WHISTON:



be

at

ad

in

for

em

ip's

ors

nes

t it

the

and

this

olly

ole-

fifth

ds :

. &

&c.

tric-

fty's

able

&c.

h his

&c.

h of

sub-

the

l, in-

tions

igned

Reli-

and

alled

f the

clara-

any

o the